00111699

THE
ASIATIC SOCIETY OF BOMBAY
Town Hall, Bombay

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 05 October, 2018

NOTICE TO SUBSCRIBERS.

MESSRS. CLARK have pleasure in forwarding to their Subscribers the First Issue of the FOREIGN THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY for 1883, viz. :—

WEISS'S BIBLICAL THEOLOGY OF NEW TESTAMENT. Vol. II.
WEISS'S LIFE OF CHRIST. Vol. I.

The Second Issue for 1883 will comprise:—

WEISS'S LIFE OF CHRIST. Vol. II.
GOEBEL ON THE PARABLES OF JESUS.

The Volumes issued during 1880, 1881, *and* 1882 *were:*—

GODET'S COMMENTARY ON THE EPISTLE OF ST. PAUL TO THE ROMANS. Two Vols.
HAGENBACH'S HISTORY OF DOCTRINES. Three Vols.
DORNER'S SYSTEM OF CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE. Four Vols.
MARTENSEN'S CHRISTIAN ETHICS. (Individual Ethics.)
MARTENSEN'S CHRISTIAN ETHICS. (Social Ethics.)
WEISS'S BIBLICAL THEOLOGY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT. Vol. I.

The FOREIGN THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY was commenced in 1846, and from that time to this Four Volumes yearly (or 146 in all) have appeared with the utmost regularity.

The Binding of the Series is modernized, so as to distinguish it from the former Series.

The Subscription Price will remain as formerly, 21s. annually for Four Volumes payable in advance. (The Subscription Price of the Volumes for 1880, 1881, 1882, 1883, is therefore Four Guineas.)

The Publishers beg to announce as in preparation—

DR. KEIL'S HANDBOOK OF BIBLICAL ARCHÆOLOGY.
GOEBEL'S PARABLES OF JESUS.
HANDBOOK OF THEOLOGICAL SCIENCE. Edited by Dr. Otto Zöckler.
SARTORIUS'S DOCTRINE OF DIVINE LOVE.

A Selection of 20 Volumes may be had at the Subscription Price of Five Guineas, from the works issued previous to commencement of New Series.

Messrs. Clark take this opportunity of expressing their thanks for the favour with which this New Series of the Foreign Theological Library has been received.

May they request an early remittance of Subscription for 1883.

CLARK'S

FOREIGN

11697

THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY.

NEW SERIES.

VOL. XIII.

Biblical Theology of the New Testament—Weiss.

VOL. II.

D. C. 42

EDINBURGH:
T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET.
1883.

PRINTED BY MORRISON AND GIBB,

FOR

T. & T. CLARK, EDINBURGH.

LONDON, ... HAMILTON, ADAMS, AND CO.

DUBLIN, ... GEO. HERBERT.

NEW YORK, . . . SCRIBNER AND WELFORD.

BIBLICAL THEOLOGY

OF

THE NEW TESTAMENT.

111699
ac

BY

DR. BERNHARD WEISS,

COUNSELLOR OF THE CONSISTORY AND PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY IN BERLIN.

Translated from the Third Revised Edition

BY

REV. JAMES E. DUGUID,

NEW MACHAR.

VOL. II.

EDINBURGH:
T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET.
1883.

111699

00111699

CONTENTS.

PART THIRD.

PAULINISM.

SECTION II.

THE DOCTRINAL SYSTEM OF THE FOUR GREAT DOCTRINAL AND CONTROVERSIAL EPISTLES—*continued.*

CHAPTER VIII.

The Doctrine of Predestination.

SECT.		PAGE
88.	Election and calling,	1
89.	The Gospel and the apostleship,	9
90.	The calling of the Gentiles,	17
91.	The hardening and the conversion of Israel,	21

CHAPTER IX.

The Doctrine of the Church.

92.	The Church and the gifts of grace,	29
93.	Church duties,	36
94.	The Church and the regulations of the natural life,	41
95.	Marriage,	46

CHAPTER X.

Eschatology.

96.	Salvation and life,	52
97.	The resurrection and the inheritance,	58
98.	The second coming of Christ and the judgment,	63
99.	The final consummation,	69

SECTION III.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF PAULINISM IN THE EPISTLES OF THE IMPRISONMENT.

CHAPTER XI.

SECT.		PAGE
100.	The doctrine of justification,	75
101.	The doctrine of salvation,	84
102.	The doctrine of wisdom,	91

CHAPTER XII.

The More Developed Doctrines.

103.	The cosmical significance of Christ,	97
104.	The work of salvation in its cosmical relation,	105
105.	The realization of salvation in the Church,	112
106.	Christianity as the principle of fellowship,	118

SECTION IV.

THE DOCTRINAL METHOD IN THE PASTORAL EPISTLES.

CHAPTER XIII.

Christianity as Doctrine.

107.	The wholesome doctrine,	125
108.	The Paulinism of the Pastoral Epistles,	131
109.	The Church and the management of the community,	138
110.	The Church's confession,	144

PART FOURTH.

THE EARLY-APOSTOLIC DOCTRINAL SYSTEM IN THE POST-PAULINE PERIOD.

INTRODUCTION.

111.	The Epistle to the Hebrews,	150
112.	The Second Epistle of Peter and the Epistle of Jude,	155
113.	The Johannean Apocalypse,	158
114.	The historical books,	161

SECTION I.

THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

CHAPTER I.

The Old and the New Covenant.

SECT.		PAGE
115.	The imperfection of the Old Covenant,	166
116.	The promise of the New Covenant,	172
117.	The realization of the New Covenant,	178

CHAPTER II.

The High Priest of the New Covenant.

118.	The Messiah as Son,	183
119.	The Messianic High Priest,	190
120.	The high priest in the holiest,	196

CHAPTER III.

The Sacrifice of the New Covenant.

121.	The sacrificial death of Christ,	202
122.	The necessity of the sacrificial death of Christ,	206
123.	The effects of the sacrificial death of Christ,	211

CHAPTER IV.

The Blessings and Duties of the New Covenant.

124.	The New Testament covenant people,	216
125.	The duty of the New Testament covenant,	223
126.	The fulfilment of the covenant promise,	229

SECTION II.

THE SECOND EPISTLE OF PETER AND THE EPISTLE OF JUDE.

CHAPTER V.

Christian Hope and Christian Striving after Virtue.

127.	The object of Christian knowledge,	234
128.	The striving after Christian virtue,	239
129.	The destruction of the world and the consummation of salvation,	244

SECTION III.

THE JOHANNEAN APOCALYPSE.

CHAPTER VI.

The Apocalyptic Picture of the Future.

SECT.		PAGE
130.	The precursors of Christ's second coming,	248
131.	The Apocalyptic reckoning of the end,	254
132.	The earthly and heavenly consummation,	261

CHAPTER VII.

The Conflict of the Present.

133.	God and His enemy,	267
134.	The Messiah,	272
135.	The saints,	277

SECTION IV.

THE HISTORICAL BOOKS.

CHAPTER VIII.

The Messiah of the Jews and the Salvation of the Gentile World.

136.	The Jewish-Christian Gospels,	283
137.	The writings of Luke,	291
138.	Christology, eschatology, angelology,	296
139.	The Paulinism of Luke,	304

PART FIFTH.

THE JOHANNEAN THEOLOGY.

INTRODUCTION.

140.	The sources of the Johannean theology,	311
141.	The character of the Johannean theology,	315
142.	Previous works on John,	320

CHAPTER I.

The Christology.

SECT. PAGE
143. The sending of the Only-begotten Son, ... 325
144. The heavenly origin of the Son of man, ... 331
145. The incarnation of the Logos, ... 337

CHAPTER II.

The Salvation in Christ.

146. Christ the Life of the World, ... 347
147. Christ the Light of the World, ... 352
148. Christ the Saviour of the World, ... 357

CHAPTER III.

The Appropriation of Salvation.

149. Faith and fellowship with Christ, ... 363
150. Fellowship with God and sonship with God, . . . 371
151. Keeping the commandments of God, ... 376

CHAPTER IV.

The Historical Realization of Salvation.

152. The preparatory revelation of God, ... 384
153. The victory over the devil, ... 392
154. The Church of the disciples, ... 399

CHAPTER V.

The Consummation of Salvation.

155. The Paraclete, ... 405
156. The fellowship of believers, ... 410
157. The last day, ... 416

BIBLICAL THEOLOGY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE DOCTRINE OF PREDESTINATION.

§ 88. *Election and Calling.*

Comp. Weiss, *die Praedestinationslehre des Apostels Paulus, in den Jahrbuchern für deutsche Theologie*, 1857, 1; W. Beyschlag, *die Paulinische Theodicee*, Berlin 1868.

THE assurance of the individual depends on his calling to the fellowship of the Christian Church, as by this calling the divine purpose of election begins to be realized towards him (*a*). God has in Himself the absolute right, *à priori*, to create men to salvation or destruction, and by the free action of His power to lead on to this goal; but in regard to the Christian salvation He has availed Himself of His right only in so far as, independently of all human works and deserts, He determines according to His absolute will to what conditions He will attach His grace (*b*). The condition with which He has connected His election is now nothing else than the love which He foreknew in the receptive soul (*c*). But the elect are called when God by His gospel works faith in them (*d*).

(*a*) If the course of the development of the Christian life is exposed to troubles of many kinds (§ 86), which may hinder it from reaching its goal; and if God alone can so strengthen him who is in trial, that he continue to stand (Rom. xiv. 4, xvi. 25),—then the Christian must have the assurance that God will even do this. This assurance rests on the faithfulness of God, who does not allow trial to become too severe (1 Cor. x. 13;

comp. Matt. xiii. 20), or who so strengthens the wavering that he continues unblameable to the end (i. 8). This presupposes that God has, as it were, become bound to the individual; and this, according to ver. 9, He has done by His calling (comp. 1 Thess. v. 24, and therewith § 62, *c*). As the calling of Israel is an irrevocable designation to the saving blessings designed for them (Rom. xi. 29; comp. § 72, *d*), so here it is a designation to the future glory (*εἰς κοινωνίαν τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ*: 1 Cor. i. 9, and therewith § 77, *d*; comp. 2 Thess. ii. 14); but therein is necessarily involved also, as with Peter (§ 45), the designation to that holiness (*κλητοὶ ἅγιοι*: 1 Cor. i. 2; Rom. i. 7; comp. 1 Thess. ii. 12, iv. 7) which God has to work in them, to prove and perfect in them, if they are to reach that goal. In our Epistles is the idea of calling for the first time quite definitely announced as the designation of a visible act done once for all, in which God has, as it were, given to the individual the assurance that He will lead him on in this way to perfect salvation; and this act is his introduction to the fellowship of the Christian Church.[1] In this act is the divine purpose expressed, to lead each to salvation, as it is already realized in the present, and yet draws near in its completion (Rom. viii. 28: *οἱ κατὰ πρόθεσιν κλητοί*); and this purpose is conceived of on the side of Him who calls according to election (ix. 11: *ἡ κατ' ἐκλογὴν πρόθεσις ἐκ τοῦ καλοῦντος*), *i.e.* so that out of the mass of humanity those are expressly chosen whom, as His holy and beloved ones, He wishes to be partakers of salvation (xi. 28; comp. Col. iii. 12; Eph. i. 4, 5). This secret divine decree of election[2]

[1] This is clear, especially from 1 Cor. vii. 18, 21, 22, according to which, each is to remain as a Christian in the same vocation in which he was called; and from vv. 17, 20, where the manner of the *κλῆσις* is itself designated as different, according to the position in life in which each Christian is. So far as the members of the Christian Church belong to Christ, they are *κλητοὶ Χριστοῦ* (Rom. i. 6); so far as they stand in a living fellowship with Christ, they are *κλητοὶ ἐν κυρίῳ* (1 Cor. vii. 22); in so far as they are free from the law, they are called *ἐπ' ἐλευθερίᾳ* (Gal. v. 13). If *καλεῖν* stands (1 Cor. x. 27) for an invitation to a feast, this naturally has nothing to do with the technical meaning of the word.

[2] *Ἐκλεκτός* (Rom. xvi. 13) naturally is not used in the technical sense of the doctrine of election, but means select, distinguished, as § 30, *d*. In other passages the idea of election is throughout not differently conceived of than by Peter and James (§ 44, 45), only that here, naturally, it refers not to a narrower election from the chosen people, but from among men generally. On the other

becomes clearly manifest in the calling to the Church (1 Cor. i. 26–28: *βλέπετε τὴν κλῆσιν ὑμῶν . . . ὅτι . . . ἐξελέξατο ὁ Θεός*; comp. 1 Thess. i. 4, 5, and therewith § 61, *b*). While God thereby takes the first step, so to speak, for carrying out the purpose He has made for the salvation of the individual (Rom. viii. 30: *οὓς προώρισεν, τούτους καὶ ἐκάλεσεν*; comp. ix. 23, 24), He gives them the assurance that He will not allow them to fail in all that follows. Even on that account, in the divine purpose of election, the matter really is as to definitive obtaining of salvation, and not merely as to the fixing the time for the realization of it.[3]

(*b*) It is implied in the very idea of election that it is a free act. The mercy of God, on which it rests, can be dependent on nothing else than God Himself as pitying (Rom. ix. 15, 16); hence it is said, ver. 18: *ὃν θέλει ἐλεεῖ. Ὃν θέλει, σκληρύνει* forms the opposite to this, and thus it appears that God has, from the beginning, created and prepared the one for salvation and the other for destruction, making the one receptive and hardening the other. In fact, the apostle vindicates for God as the creator the absolute right to do this, just as the potter in the simile has the absolute right, out of the same lump to form vessels to an honourable and a dis-

hand, it refers (comp. Beyschlag, p. 87) even in our Epistles, as in the election of Israel, to a historical, and not to a pre-temporal act of God, as in 2 Thess. ii. 13 the reading *ἀπ' ἀρχῆς* is incorrect (comp. § 61, *c*), and 1 Cor. ii. 7 speaks of the eternal purpose of salvation and not of election.

[3] Beyschlag, p. 36, has abundantly proved, against von Hofmann, that in the idea of election there is necessarily implied an opposite to such,—those, namely, who are not elected (comp. *e.g.* Rom. xi. 7); for one may refer election, but not with him, simply to the point of time in which grace is brought savingly to bear on the individual, so that thereby a universal purpose of salvation would not be excluded. The passage, Rom. v. 18, says only that the *δικαίωμα* of Christ has a universal significance for the whole human race, as the *παράπτωμα* of Adam, while (ver. 19) those only are expressly designated as *οἱ πολλοί* who, as a matter of fact, have become righteous (and blessed); and, according to the connection (Rom. xi. 32), only says that God finally has pity on the Jew as on the Gentile, as the *πάντας* without the article refers to the *ὑμεῖς* and *αὐτοί* (vv. 30, 31), i.e. to the *converted* heathen and to Israel (as a people). This reference needs no *ἀμφοτέρους*, as Beyschlag, p. 51, supposes, while a reference to all individuals would necessarily require the *πάντας* to be without the article, a fact which Pfleiderer, p. 253 f. [E. T. i. 256]), overlooks; and he, moreover, from a philosophical contemplation of the apostle's teaching regarding the relation of the calling of the Gentiles to Israel (§ 91), draws dogmatic conclusions in the sense of Beyschlag's, which destroy the idea of election.

honourable use (vv. 20, 21).[4] On the contrary, when he comes to speak of the actual attainment of salvation, by means of a δέ he puts the actual dealings of God at present in express contrast with the former right vindicated for God *in abstracto* (ver. 22). The σκεύη ὀργῆς κατηρτισμένα εἰς ἀπώλειαν are by no means men whom He has fitted for destruction, in order to make known by them His wrath and His power; but, according to the connection, the Jews, who on account of their unbelief had fallen under God's wrath and so were ripe for destruction, but whom He, deferring the exhibition of His anger and His avenging power, has nevertheless till now endured with much long-suffering, in order to lead them to repentance (ii. 4).[5] The προητοίμασεν in ix. 23 cannot, conformably with this, refer to the creation of vessels of mercy, but only to their preparation for this by preventing grace, which works indeed in the paedagogic leading both of heathenism and Judaism (comp. § 70, 72). That the election, according to note *a*, consists in a selection from the collective number of human individuals, excludes a

[4] It appears then to be assumed by him that God has availed Himself of this right in individual cases, in order to show His perfect freedom to do so. In this sense he refers to Scripture statements regarding Jacob and Esau (Mal. i. 2, 3; comp. Rom. ix. 13) on the one hand, and regarding Pharaoh (Ex. ix. 16; comp. Rom. ix. 17) on the other, because these, from their terms, in conformity with his method of interpretation, and without reference to their connection and historical reference (comp. § 74, *c*), appear to require this explanation. Moved by dogmatic prepossessions, one might reserve the idea, that even in reference to those who, in the course of the historical development of the kingdom, seem to be excluded from salvation, God's mercy may somewhere and in some way bring salvation; but for Paul, at any rate, it is sufficient that Esau, by his exclusion from the theocratic inheritance, is shut out from salvation; and likewise Pharaoh, when God hardened him, to show in him His might (in the judgment which brought destruction on him). The considerations by which Beyschlag (p. 39) seeks to weaken the example of Esau, are shown to be even not Pauline, and those about Pharaoh (p. 60) depend on the reference of ver. 22 to him, and that is undoubtedly false.

[5] Even Beyschlag, p. 53 f., has acknowledged the distinct turn which is introduced into the line of thought (Rom. ix. 22), and has conclusively proved that the vessels of wrath here mentioned cannot be identical with the σκεύη εἰς ἀτιμίαν, referred to hypothetically (ver. 21), as God cannot be angry at that which He has Himself made. But the objection he makes (p. 58) against the Calvinistic interpretation depends on his referring (ver. 22) to Pharaoh (comp. footnote 4), as God may indeed wait with much long-suffering for a number who have already incurred His wrath, even though not one of them repents, but not for Pharaoh, whom He has Himself hardened, in order to show His (judicial) might. But that Paul quite intentionally avoids ἃ κατήρτισεν, exactly corre-

creation of two classes of men destined for two separate ends, and yet more decisively so does everything which Paul teaches, according to § 67, as to Adam's transgression and its results, inasmuch as in a very different sense, at all events, could it be said of men created *à priori* for destruction, than of those destined to salvation, that by the transgression of Adam have they come under the dominion of sin and death. If Paul (ver. 18), in a way which approaches a predestination from arbitrary will, maintains the unfettered will of God in His mercy, this is in opposition to the Jews, who supposed that, through their acknowledged efforts after righteousness (ix. 31, x. 2), they had a claim on salvation above that of the heathen, in order to establish the truth that the mercy of God involved in election does not depend on the willing or the running of men (ix. 16). The κατ' ἐκλογὴν πρόθεσις is not to be dependent on ἐξ ἔργων (ver. 11); because ἐκλογή, which is the ultimate ground of the Christian salvation, as of the quality of that salvation generally, must be an act of grace, an ἐκλογὴ χάριτος (xi. 5).[6] It by no means follows from this

sponding with ἃ προητοίμασεν, plainly shows that he wished it to be taken as an adjective. This is by no means inconsistent with the word, as Pfleiderer, p. 245 (E. T. i. 248]), asserts (comp. 1 Cor. i. 10). Very energetically also does the latter contend against the proper interpretation of ver. 22. It is in vain, however, that he seeks to turn away the reference to the revelation of wrath at the last day (comp. Rom. ii. 5), and to introduce here the thought that the hardening of one is but a temporary state which will end in an act of grace (comp., on the contrary, footnote 3), although he admits himself that this thought is left quite untouched by the apostle (p. 246 [E. T. i. 249]). Rather only on that account, along with the aim of the μακροθυμία, self-evident according to ii. 4, could the aim referring to the vessels of mercy be at the same time (καί: also) attained, because without that long-suffering the last judgment would have carried off the vessels of wrath, but would also have made impossible every wider development, and so the call of the vessels of mercy. On the other hand, the simple "preservation of the vessels of wrath" (p. 244 [E. T. i. 247]) cannot be referred to the μακροθυμία, which, besides, would have no meaning as applied to a quality produced by God Himself.

[6] As χάριτι and ἐξ ἔργων stand in irreconcilable opposition (ver. 6; comp. § 75, b), inasmuch as every human work creates merit (iv. 4), then an ἐκλογὴ ἐκ ἔργων would no more be an act of grace. It is not enough, to be sure, to say that the tendency of such setting the one over against the other by the apostle is to show the Jews that they can raise no objection to the contrary if God makes, not merit from works, but faith, to be the condition of obtaining salvation; for Beyschlag, p. 83, rightly notices that the reference here is not to the condition of justification, with its οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων, ἀλλ' ἐκ πίστεως, but to the condition of election, which, according to note *d*, has the production of faith in the act of calling as its result.

that God must act from pure arbitrariness by election, as regards those He chooses to pity, but only, that it depends on Himself alone, what the conditions are on which He makes election to salvation depend.

(*c*) The passage, Rom. viii. 28–30, announces, in the plainest terms, on what the assurance of the predestined rests. Those whom God has once predestinated to salvation (ver. 29), He conducts with steady hand from the first beginning of the Christian life to its completion (ver. 30), so that all that happens to them in this way must serve their best interests (ver. 28). And now it is here expressly said (ver. 29) that He predestinated those whom He foreknew.[7] But this foreknowledge can refer only to that quality on which God has determined, according to His free will, to make election depend; and what that is, is explicitly stated in the connection of vv. 28 and 29. If those for whose best interests all things contribute are designated, ver. 28, first as those who love God, and afterwards as those who are called according to His purpose, then ver. 29, introduced as giving the reason, removes the apparent contradiction between the latter objective and the former subjective sign, that God has ordained even those to salvation, and conformably to that foreordination has called those (ver. 30) whom He has foreknown as such, viz. as love Him. Also, 1 Cor. viii. 3, it is said that he who loves God is known as such by Him, and, according to ii. 9, God has prepared all salvation for such as love Him. We have already found love to God made by James the condition of election (§ 54, *a*); and while, according to him, this love to God is found in the πτώχοι (ii. 5), so here, too, it is those who before the world are the foolish, the weak, and the despised whom God has chosen (1 Cor. i. 27, 28;

[7] When Pfleiderer, p. 249 [E. T. i. 252], reasserts that προγινώσκειν can mean only "to appoint beforehand," he has not shown the linguistic right to do so, because it can only mean (Rom. xi. 2; comp. § 91, *a*), as in 1 Pet. i. 20 (comp. § 48, *a*), to foreknow. But even the context excludes his interpretation; for, should οὓς προέγνω really indicate only "the persons," and καὶ προώρισεν only the "determination" of the selection=election, then this would be indicated by a repetition of the *same* word. Also, according to Gal. iv. 9, the being known of God is the ultimate ground of all salvation (γνόντες τὸν Θεόν, μᾶλλον δὲ γνωσθέντες ὑπὸ Θεοῦ). Pfleiderer, on the other hand, rightly contends against the reference of προγινώσκειν to a foreknowledge of faith.

comp. § 29, *d*). But naturally this love is not regarded by Paul as a human act, as, according to note *b*, such a thing cannot possibly be the condition of election; it is rather the opposite of all personal acts and service; it is rather that pure longing for God, needing salvation, which alone guarantees perfect receptivity for the working of grace. Even *this* very receptivity is to be regarded as produced in them by means of God's discipline in life (Rom. ix. 23: προητοίμασεν; comp. note *b*); but even in the way in which individuals allow the grace which meets men in that discipline to prepare them to be such as are receptive of the decisive working of grace, God acknowledges them as those who love Him. On this very account the wise, the noble, the mighty of this world are in general not elected (1 Cor. i. 26), because in the pride of their possessions, and in contentment therewith, they do not feel that need of something higher which alone makes one receptive of divine grace.

(*d*) If the elect are to be called of God, *i.e.* if they are to be introduced into the Church of Christ (note *a*), then faith has to be wrought in them, for even the calling is nothing else than the working of divine grace producing faith, and thus, even when the believer feels himself moved of himself to get baptism and to become a member of the Church, summoning him for the Church by an inner compulsion of his own. But as faith proceeds from the message (of the salvation which has appeared in Christ) springing from a divine command (Rom. x. 17; comp. 1 Cor. xv. 11), so the calling is realized by the preaching of the gospel (comp. 2 Thess. ii. 14; and along with that § 61, *b*; Eph. iii. 6).[8] According to 1 Cor.

[8] According to Gal. i. 6, the calling rests on the evidence of grace Christ has given us in His atoning death; for without this there had been no redeemed Church, and therefore no calling into its fellowship. But if the μετατίθεσθαι . . . εἰς ἕτερον εὐαγγέλιον is at the same time a fall ἀπὸ τοῦ καλέσαντος ὑμᾶς, it is clear from this that the calling was brought about by the true gospel, which proclaimed that atoning death and the redemption based on it. On this account a human persuasion in favour of Jewish errors, v. 8, may oppose the work of divine grace in the calling, which is accordingly an impulse towards obedience to the truth (ver. 7: τῇ ἀληθείᾳ . . . πείθεσθαι), and is brought about by the gospel, whose contents form the truth (Gal. ii. 5, 14: ἀλήθεια τοῦ εὐαγγελίου; 2 Cor. vi. 7: λόγος ἀληθείας; comp. Eph. i. 13; Col. i. 5). So far, now, as the apostle has converted the members of the Church to faith, the calling mediated by him may be termed a begetting by the gospel (1 Cor. iv. 15). That the

ii. 5, the faith of the Christian is not to rest on the wisdom of men, but upon the power of God, *i.e.*, according to the connection with ver. 4, on the working of the divine power which comes from the Spirit of God working by the gospel. Faith is therefore a work of grace (comp. 2 Thess. iii. 2; Phil. i. 29), for which the apostle gives God thanks (Rom. i. 8; comp. 2 Thess. i. 3; Eph. i. 15, 16; Col. i. 3), but which does not come to all to whom the gospel comes. Not for all is the gospel a divine power, but for those who (according to the divine purpose) have been delivered (1 Cor. i. 18), *i.e.*, according to ver. 24, for the called or the elect (vv. 27, 28). But for those who are not called and have hence fallen under condemnation, the gospel is not only folly (vv. 18, 23), in so far as it remains hid from them in its real saving significance (2 Cor. iv. 3), but a savour of death (2 Cor. ii. 15, 16), in so far as unbelief of God's word robs them of the only means of salvation, but as guilty disobedience it brings upon them sure destruction (2 Thess. i. 8; comp. § 61, *c*). For even here unbelief appears incidentally as self-condemned disobedience to the truth of the gospel (Gal. v. 7; Rom. x. 16), as faith is set forth as a spontaneous reception of the grace (2 Cor. vi. 1) offered in the gospel (comp. 1 Thess. i. 6). Surely in this sense faith (1 Cor. i. 21; Rom. i. 16) is evidently not the operation of the gospel, but the condition (dependent on men themselves) on which the gospel works deliverance (§ 82, *d*). This apparent contradiction is removed in this way, that the election, in consequence of which faith works, according to note *c*, has become connected with a definite and previously known quality of man, from which by an inner necessity proceeds the free reception of the word which works and will work faith, the fulfilment of the command of obedience which it claims.[9] So little does

working of faith is put necessarily in the calling, it follows from this that δικαίωσις (Rom. viii. 30) is also mentioned as the direct result of the calling, as it elsewhere appears connected with the condition of faith.

[9] It were accordingly to distinguish between the obedient reception of the word on the part of man which proceeds from the love of God, the receptive longing for salvation, and the conviction of the truth of the word wrought in man by the word in consequence of that, from which again justifying saving faith in the specific sense results. But it must be admitted that Paul, as little here as in the Epistle to the Thessalonians, has distinguished these two

Paul in consequence think of an irresistible working of grace, which requires no point of contact with men, so far from him is the thought of any irrevocableness of such working of grace. To be sure (Gal. iv. 9), when he traces our knowledge of God (which implies a reception of the gospel by faith) back to our being known (and the election which thereupon follows; comp. note *c*, footnote 7), he speaks of the falling away threatened, and the possibility of this forms the ground presupposition for all his exhortations (comp. *e.g.* Gal. v. 1–4; 2 Cor. vi. 1; Rom. xi. 20–22). The whole doctrine of election has even now the tendency to make the believer in it sure that the grace of God which has called him can and will lead him to the goal thereby presented to him (comp. note *a*). It will, on its part, fail in nothing to preserve and perfect the faith it has produced, and it is and continues to be the condition of all confirmation (§ 86, *d*); so that for every one longing for salvation, so long as he continues to long for it, the way to salvation is already prepared.

§ 89. *The Gospel and the Apostleship.*

The gospel in calling can only quicken faith, because it is a word of God, though preached indeed by men, but working with divine power through the Spirit of God (*a*). For its proclamation the apostles have been chosen of God, called and sent by Christ, since it has been directly revealed to them by Christ and His Spirit (*b*). The only specific token of this apostolic calling is the success of their activity in founding churches—a success given them by God—and indirectly the gift of miracles (*c*). In contradistinction from the Twelve, and those who besides them were called to apostolic activity,

points. As God is thanked for the δίχεσθαι τὸν λόγον (1 Thess. ii. 13), so the ὑπακοὴ ἐθνῶν (Rom. xv. 18; comp. i. 5, xvi. 26: ὑπακοὴ πίστεως) appears as a work of God; and in the idea of πίστις both are completely merged in one. The apostle has not yet required on this point a union conformable to the thought; salvation is to him as certain, even from its first beginning in a divine working of grace, as it is self-evident to him that man is responsible for the point whether this gracious working enter him or not. His doctrine of the divine foreknowledge (which is certainly not a foreknowledge of faith which He Himself produces, but of a receptivity by which He alone can and will work faith) already indicates some such union, only that it is not comprehensively seized.

Paul is conscious that he has been called to be the Apostle of the Gentiles (*d*).

(*a*) If the gospel is to work faith with divine power in the calling, it must carry in itself a divine power, and accordingly that is in the first place the fact, because it is a glad message come from God (*εὐαγγέλιον Θεοῦ*: 2 Cor. xi. 7; Rom. i. 1, xv. 16; comp. 1 Thess. ii. 2, viii. 9), in which God Himself speaks, and the salvation provided in Christ is by Him revealed to men (*ἀποκαλύπτεται*: Rom. i. 17; comp. Gal. iii. 23; *φανεροῦται*: 2 Cor. ii. 14; Rom. iii. 21; comp. Col. i. 26).[1] As a message coming from God, it stands, as with Peter (§ 46, *a*), on the same level with the Old Testament word of revelation (Rom. iii. 2, 4, ix. 6: *ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ*; comp. 1 Cor. xv. 54: *ὁ λόγος ὁ γεγραμμένος*), and, like Peter, Paul transfers passages which speak of the one *ῥῆμα* without more ado to the other (Rom. x. 8–18); he calls it *ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ* (1 Cor. xiv. 36; 2 Cor. ii. 17, iv. 2; comp. 1 Thess. i. 8; 2 Thess. iii. 1, and therewith § 61, *b*), and affirms that it is the word of God in truth (1 Thess. ii. 13). Inasmuch as God has now to make use of human instruments for the execution of this message, His word is preached (*κηρύσσειν*: Gal. ii. 2; 1 Cor. xv. 11, ix. 27; Rom. x. 8; comp. 1 Thess. ii. 9; Col. i. 23), it is a *κήρυγμα* (1 Cor. i. 21) which comes from the apostle as its preacher (1 Cor. ii. 4, xv. 14).[2]

[1] It has to be noticed that *τὸ εὐαγγέλιον* designates not only the message as to its contents, what is proclaimed, but also the act of proclaiming (Rom. i. 9; 1 Cor. ix. 18; 2 Cor. viii. 18, x. 14), and the genitive connected with it not only the contents (*εὐαγγέλιον Χριστοῦ*: *evangelium de Christo*, Gal. i. 7; 1 Cor. ix. 12, 18; 2 Cor. ii. 12, ix. 13, x. 14; Rom. i. 9, xv. 19; comp. 1 Thess. iii. 2; 2 Thess. i. 8; Phil. i. 27, and therewith Gal. i. 16: *εὐαγγελίζεσθαι τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ*; comp. Phil. i. 15, 18), but also those who proclaim the message (2 Cor. iv. 3; Rom. ii. 16, xvi. 25; comp. 1 Thess. i. 5; 2 Thess. ii. 14). And so *ὁ λόγος* designates not only the word of proclamation as to its contents (Gal. vi. 6; comp. 1 Thess. i. 6; Col. iv. 3; Phil. i. 14), but also the act of proclaiming (*ὁ λόγος ἡμῶν*: 2 Cor. i. 18; comp. 2 Thess. iii. 14), especially when the manner of this proclamation is more particularly defined (1 Cor. i. 17, ii. 1, 4; comp. *λόγοι*, ii. 4, 13, xiv. 19). The contents of this *λόγος* is the cross (1 Cor. i. 18), or the atonement thereby provided (2 Cor. v. 19). The contents of the gospel is incidentally more closely defined as the divine glory of the exalted Christ (2 Cor. iv. 4), or as faith in Him who is proclaimed as the condition of salvation.

[2] Instead of this, it is called, 1 Cor. i. 6, the testimony of Christ (*μαρτύριον τοῦ Χριστοῦ*), or, 2 Thess. i. 10: *τὸ μαρτύριον ἡμῶν* (comp. also 1 Cor. ii. 1: *τὸ μαρτύριον τοῦ Θεοῦ*). The contents, also, of the *κήρυγμα* is Christ (Rom. xvi. 25:

If, to be sure, the divine contents of the message are not to be stripped of their special power and efficiency by this necessary human agency, if God Himself is to speak by His messengers in the behalf of Christ (2 Cor. v. 20), then it must be preached without human wisdom of speech (1 Cor. i. 17), *i.e.* without rhetorical and philosophical art (ii. 1), from the standpoint of human wisdom as foolish preaching (i. 21, iii. 18, iv. 10); much less is it to be corrupted by human additions (2 Cor. ii. 17, iv. 2: *καπηλεύειν, δολοῦν*). The gospel must work by its own power simply, not by persuasive words of wisdom,—by that only a *πεισμονή*, as Gal. v. 8 (§ 88, *d*, footnote 8), can be attained,—but by the demonstration which the Spirit of God, working in this word of God, and the mighty power flowing from the Spirit, produces (1 Cor. ii. 4; comp. 2 Cor. vi. 7: *ἐν λόγῳ ἀληθείας, ἐν δυνάμει Θεοῦ*). The contents and form of what is preached has to be given to the preacher by the same Spirit (1 Cor. ii. 12, 13), so that it is a *λόγος ἐν δυνάμει πνεύματος* (Rom. xv. 19; comp. 1 Thess. i. 5). And thus the mighty power of the gospel, which produces, not the new life, as in the early apostolic preaching (§ 40, *b*; 46, *a*; 52, *b*), but faith, is traced back to the Spirit of God effectual in the preachers (comp. already § 61, *b*). And this inspiration of the Spirit does not certainly consist simply in the enlightenment, by which they know the truth of the gospel, but in enabling them to preach it with the power of God—a power effectual in producing faith.[3]

κήρυγμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ; comp. 1 Cor. xv. 12; 2 Cor. i. 19), whom the apostle preaches (2 Cor. iv. 5, xi. 4; comp. Phil. i. 15), and Him as crucified (1 Cor. i. 23).

[3] Christ already promised His disciples that, when called to bear witness for Him before judgment-seats, the Spirit would give them *what* and *how* they should speak (Matt. x. 19); and with Peter also the preacher proclaims the gospel through the Holy Ghost (1 Pet. i. 12). What is thereby meant is naturally not a mechanical inflowing of definite words, as the teaching of the Spirit forms the contrast, 1 Cor. ii. 13, to the teaching of human wisdom, and it does not even instil single words, but enables to find them; the Spirit appears rather as the source of spiritual gifts, with which God (or Christ) equips His servants for their work (comp. § 84, *a*, footnote 3). And hence every gift of grace, which Paul wishes to impart by his preaching, is wrought by the Spirit (Rom. i. 11), and when he comes with the fulness of the blessing, it is yet a blessing which comes from Christ (xv. 29), who has wrought it by His Spirit, wherewith He has equipped His apostle. The Church, which Paul by his preaching has gathered together, is an Epistle written (where this Spirit has

(*b*) For a proclamation of the gospel that shall quicken faith, special organs must therefore be authorized and equipped. How shall they believe, if they have not heard? how shall they hear without a preacher? and how shall they preach if they have not been sent? (Rom. x. 14, 15). In this sense are the apostles messengers, commissioned with the preaching of the gospel (Gal. ii. 7; 1 Thess. ii. 4), ambassadors for Christ, by whom God speaks (2 Cor. v. 20). They are, as servants of the new covenant (iii. 6), sent exclusively to preach the gospel (1 Cor. i. 17),[4] and this they are to do in order thereby to produce faith (Rom. i. 5: *εἰς ὑπακοὴν πίστεως*; comp. 1 Cor. iii. 5: *διάκονοι δι' ὧν ἐπιστεύσετε*). If the calling to the Christian Church is brought about by the work of the apostles, then for these there must be a special calling, and that again, according to § 88, *a*, points back to a special election. God has separated the apostle from his mother's womb (Acts ix. 15: *σκεῦος ἐκλογῆς*; comp. xxvi. 17), and called him by His grace (Gal. i. 15); he is a *κλητὸς ἀπόστολος διὰ θελήματος Θεοῦ* (1 Cor. i. 1; 2 Cor. i. 1; comp. Eph. i. 1; Col. i. 1); *ἀφωρισμένος εἰς εὐαγγέλιον Θεοῦ* (Rom. i. 1).[5] As the general calling of Christians is now effected by the preaching of Christ, the apostles, who are to preach this gospel to all others, must be themselves called by Christ (Rom. i. 5: *οἱ' ου ἐλάβομεν χάριν καὶ ἀποστολήν*; comp. Acts xx. 24), who has sent them (1 Cor. i. 17: *ἐπέστειλέν με Χριστός*; hence *ἀπόστολος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*, i. 1; 2 Cor. i. 1, xi. 13; comp. 1 Thess. ii. 6; Eph. i. 1, iii. 5; Col. i. 1; as 2 Cor. viii. 23; Phil. ii. 25: *ἀπόστολος*

quickened faith) by Christ in the hearts of men by the Spirit of the living God, but which has been brought about by the ministry of the apostle (2 Cor. iii. 3).

[4] This Paul will apprehend so strongly that he undertakes the work of baptizing only occasionally (1 Cor. i. 14–16), hands it over usually to others, as, moreover, Peter seems also to have done (Acts x. 48).

[5] Even this calling according to election rests on a divine foreknowledge (comp. § 88, *c*); for God, who tries the heart, has found the apostle meet to be put in trust with the gospel (1 Thess. ii. 4), and that naturally excludes in this case, as little as it does in the general calling of Christians, the truth that it is God who has made him fit for this service (2 Cor. iii. 6). The grace of God, which calls all the elect to be members of the Christian Church, while it called him to be a Christian, has at the same time specially called him to be an apostle (*ἡ χάρις ἡ δοθεῖσάν μοι*: Gal. ii. 9; 1 Cor. iii. 10; Rom. i. 5, xii. 3, xv. 15, and therewith § 75, *c*).

ἐκκλησιας). With great emphasis Paul lays stress on the fact that he is ἀπόστολος οὐκ ἀπ' ἀνθρώπων, οὐδὲ δι' ἀνθρώπων, ἀλλὰ διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ Θεοῦ πατρός (Gal. i. 1). But this calling or mission of his was effected by Christ, when he saw the Lord (on the road to Damascus, § 58, *c*), and hence this occurrence belongs essentially to the conditions of his apostolic dignity (1 Cor. ix. 1, xv. 8, 9; comp. Phil. iii. 12).[6] As, now, in the calling of the apostle Christ Himself takes the place of the gospel of Christ, so immediate revelation takes the place of the publishing the truth by the gospel. It pleased God, who chose the apostle and called him, to reveal His Son in him, that he might be able to preach Him (Gal. i. 16). It was not from men that he had received or learned the gospel, but by the revelation given him by Christ (δι' ἀποκαλύψεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ver. 12); and he proves this in this way, that his intercourse with the earlier apostles was not of such a kind as that he could learn the gospel from them (vv. 13–24), that rather his gospel was acknowledged by them to be his own (ii. 1–10), and it was made good by him when needful as against them (vv. 11–21). Christ has revealed Himself to him, not only when He appeared to him on the way to Damascus, but also when He made known to him, by visions and revelations, the full significance of His person and work (2 Cor. xii. 1–7; comp. 1 Cor. xi. 23, and therewith § 85, *b*), and by His Spirit taught him to know thoroughly the depths of the divine purposes of salvation.[7]

[6] As Christ has commissioned him in the execution of His Father's will, for that reason he stands in a like relation of service to Christ as he does to God. He is God's servant (διάκονος: 2 Cor. vi. 4; comp. 2 Cor. iii. 7–9; Rom. xi. 13), His fellow-worker (συνεργός: 1 Cor. iii. 9; comp. 1 Thess. iii. 2), the οἰκονόμος over His μυστήρια (1 Cor. iv. 1, 2, and therewith § 75, *a*; comp. ix. 17); he is at the same time Christ's servant (διάκονος: 2 Cor. xi. 23; comp. Col. i. 7; iv. 7; ὑπηρέτης: 1 Cor. iv. 1; λειτουργός: Rom. xv. 16) and slave (δοῦλος: Gal. i. 10; Rom. i. 1; Phil. i. 1).

[7] Thus it is afresh clear, that this origin of his gospel by revelation by no means excludes the claim that Paul received the historical elements of his preaching from tradition (§ 78, *a*), and in many ways appropriated the forms of doctrine offered him (§ 58, *d*); but in all these did not lie the special efficacy of his preaching. His gospel is certainly not a communication of historical facts as such, or a peculiar system of doctrine, but nothing else primarily than making known the secrets of the saving purpose of God (Rom. xvi. 25: ἀποκάλυψις μυστηρίου), the contents of which God has revealed to the apostle by His Spirit (1 Cor. ii. 7, 10, 12; comp. Eph. iii. 3, 5).

The endowment of the Spirit, which this experience of revelation presupposes, is, according to § 84, naturally nothing exclusively peculiar to the apostle. What is special to him is only this, that that knowledge of saving truth, which all others receive by apostolic preaching, he has received directly from God through Christ, or through His Spirit, and has thus been made fit to be a servant of the new covenant (2 Cor. iii. 5, 8).[8]

(*c*) The preaching of the gospel, not even that professional preaching (1 Cor. ix. 4) which establishes the right to get support from the Church (vv. 7–13), is in no way bound to the apostleship; Paul mentions a long list of fellow-workers (Rom. xvi. 3, ix. 21; comp. Phil. ii. 25, iv. 3; Col. iv. 11; Philem. 1, 24) who, like Timothy (1 Thess. iii. 2), were with him *συνεργοὶ Θεοῦ ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ*, and like him carried on the work of the Lord (1 Cor. xvi. 10). If the usual task of these fellow-workers was the nourishing and extension of the churches, yet their activity might on occasion be effectual in quickening faith, as he mentions himself and Apollos jointly as *διάκονοι, δι' ὧν ἐπιστεύσατε* (iii. 5). Nevertheless, this latter result of gospel preaching continued to be the specific token of apostolic dignity; for he on his part has been called to be an apostle (note *b*), and the Spirit (as the source of gifts of grace) works in him the capacity for a divinely effectual preaching of the gospel both as to contents and form (ii. 13;

[8] Paul means only that he *also* has received the Spirit of God (1 Cor. vii. 40); and therefore he ascribes to his *γνώμη*, given him in this spirit as to things which do not concern saving truth, no binding authority (vii. 25, 35; comp. 2 Cor. viii. 10 with ver. 8), when he is also conscious to himself that, in virtue of the mercy he has received of the Lord, when called to be an apostle, he is faithful (1 Cor. vii. 25: *πίστος*), and could thus make good his *γνώμη* as worthy of attention. It is, however, connected with his special calling, that in virtue of his mission he has the power, in Christ's name, to make regulations in the Church (1 Cor. xiv. 37 reads: *ἃ γράφω ὑμῖν ἐντολὴ κυρίου ἐστίν*; comp. § 62, *a*; 87, *c*), for which he claims the obedience of the Church (2 Cor. ii. 9, vii. 15, x. 6; comp. Phil. ii. 12; Philem. 21), although he always distinguishes between these regulations of his, in the name of Christ, and those which are directly by Christ Himself (1 Cor. vii. 10, ix. 14). To these belong in particular the decisions uttered in the name of Christ (1 Cor. v. 4), regarding which he has no doubt that the result will prove that Christ has spoken in him and by him (2 Cor. xiii. 3, 4; comp. x. 6). Yet this authority which the Lord has given him has ever to be used so as to serve for the *οἰκοδομή*, and not for the *καθαίρεσις* of the Church (2 Cor. x. 8, xiii. 10).

comp. note *a*). That Paul was put in trust with the gospel (Gal. ii. 7) was acknowledged by the early apostles, and that God had been powerful to give him this result (ver. 8). As election to salvation was generally acknowledged by this fact, that the gospel became effectual to the individual (1 Thess. i. 4, 5; comp. § 61, *b*), so election to the apostleship was acknowledged by this, that this efficacy came from the preaching of the apostle (1 Cor. ix. 1). As individuals were called to the fellowship of the Christian Church by preaching which quickened faith, so the specific result of apostolic preaching is the founding of a church (1 Cor. iii. 10: *κατὰ τὴν χάριν τὴν δοθεῖσάν μοι . . . θεμέλιον τέθεικα*; comp. vv. 6–8: *ἐφύτευσα*).[9] Christ wrought, no doubt, by the apostle not only *λόγῳ*, but also *ἔργῳ* (Rom. xv. 18); in the former respect it is the *δύναμις πνεύματος* which was shown in the results of his activity, in the latter it is the *δύναμις σημείων καὶ τεράτων* which became manifest in him (ver. 19). And hence he also regards these *σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα καὶ δυνάμεις* (2 Cor. xii. 12) as the signs of his apostleship (*σημεῖα τοῦ ἀποστόλου*; comp. Acts xv. 10).[10] But these could only prove it indirectly, inasmuch as he who was evidently favoured

[9] It is hence the fundamental principle of the apostle to preach the gospel only there, where the name of Christ is not yet known (Rom. xv. 20), so that his specific apostolic calling may be verified. As he calls those whom he has converted his (spiritual) children (1 Cor. iv. 17; comp. Philem. 10), so is he also the father of the churches which he has planted (1 Cor. iv. 15; Gal. iv. 19); he is their apostle in a special sense (1 Cor. ix. 2). They are the seal of his apostleship (1 Cor. ix. 2), his letter of commendation (2 Cor. iii. 2).

[10] It is clear from the first passage that thereby only mighty works of a spiritual kind can possibly be understood. But of what sort these mighty works were we know not. We learn incidentally that Paul possessed the gift of tongues in a pre-eminently high degree (1 Cor. xiv. 18), and that he trusted to the full authority, with the help of the *δύναμις Χριστοῦ*, which also dwelt in him (2 Cor. xii. 9), to deliver one over to Satan for the destruction of the flesh (1 Cor. v. 4, 5), *i.e.* to inflict on him a bodily sickness which Satan was to bring about (comp. Acts xiii. 9–11). If he glories (2 Cor. xii. 1–7) in his visions and revelations, then these were to some extent the possession of others in the Church (1 Cor. xiv. 6, 26; comp. Eph. i. 17), which was not lacking in these mighty works of different kinds (1 Cor. xii. 9, 10, 29, 30). Even the appearance of Christ given him is not in itself a specific proof of his apostleship. Without that he might have been an apostle (1 Cor. ix. 1, and therewith note *b*); but Christ appeared to more than five hundred brethren without these becoming on that account apostles (1 Cor. xv. 6). If he from this appearance claimed to be called an apostle, yet the one decisive criterion for the truth of this claim continued to be the result of his activity in founding churches.

by the help of Christ could show himself in no deceitful way as His apostle.

(*d*) What Paul teaches about the apostolic office is plainly drawn from his own apostolic consciousness and his experience of life. It allows, therefore, but partially a direct application to the first apostles, whom, however, he acknowledges as such (Gal. i. 17: *οἱ πρὸ ἐμοῦ ἀπόστολοι*). He calls himself the least of the apostles, who is not worthy to bear the name of an apostle, because he persecuted the Church of God (1 Cor. xv. 9); but he frankly declares, with thanksgiving to the grace of God, that he had wrought more than all (ver. 10). Paul, moreover, does not appear to have restricted the circle of apostles to himself and the early apostles.[11] But the early apostles at Jerusalem had not only acknowledged his apostleship in general; they had come to be convinced in particular that he, according to the grace given him, had been put in trust with the *εὐαγγέλιον τῆς ἀκροβυστίας*, even as Peter with the *εὐαγγέλιον τῆς περιτομῆς* (Gal. ii. 7–9). He was himself conscious that the object of his *ἀποστολή* was, to work the obedience of faith among all nations (Rom. i. 5; comp. ver. 14),—that he is the *λειτουργὸς Χριστοῦ εἰς τὰ ἔθνη* (xv. 16), the *ἀπόστολος ἐθνῶν* (xi. 13; comp. Eph. iii. 8, 1; Acts xxvi. 17). As such he had to preach the gospel to the heathen, and thereby to lead them to the fellowship of the Church. Therewith it was given that heathens as such, and not merely after they had received circumcision and the law (by doing

[11] To be sure, when (1 Thess. ii. 4, 6) he seems to designate Silas and Timothy as apostles of Christ, who have been put in trust with the gospel, it may here remain doubtful whether the plural may not be simply a rhetorical figure; Timothy in particular, as often as he is elsewhere named, appears throughout only as his fellow-worker. On the contrary (1 Cor. xv. 7), Paul speaks of all the apostles in express contradistinction from the Twelve (ver. 5). James seems to be included by name among the former, and, in Gal. i. 19, he is in a certain sense put in a position of equality with the apostles, as the Lord's brothers generally are (1 Cor. ix. 5), and perhaps Paul considered him called to apostolic activity by the appearance of Christ given to him (1 Cor. xv. 7). Barnabas, too, who in Acts xiv. 4, 14 is directly called *ἀπόστολος*, he puts quite on the same level with himself (Gal. ii. 9; comp. 1 Cor. ix. 6). The *ὑπερλίαν ἀπόστολοι*, who opposed the apostle at Corinth (2 Cor. xi. 5, xii. 11), he not simply rejects, along with their claim to apostolic dignity, but he seeks to show on other grounds that they are *ψευδαπόστολοι* (2 Cor. xi. 13). On the whole, then, he must have regarded it as possible that others also besides him and the Twelve might be called to apostolic activity.

that they became Jews), were called to participation in the Christian salvation. But that leads us here also, according to the peculiarity of our apostle (comp. § 69, *a*), from the rather dogmatic consideration of election and calling, to the question, how has this calling been realized historically, *i.e.* therefore, in particular, in relation to the two great portions of pre-Christian humanity, Gentiles and Jews.

§ 90. *The Calling of the Gentiles.*

The universality of the Christian salvation is based as much on the universal human need as on its complete newness, as much on the unity of God as on the universal dominion of Christ (*a*). God had not bound Himself by a promise to the Gentiles, yet the extension of the calling even to them had been often prophesied in the Scriptures (*b*). Israel's privilege, moreover, by which they were first to obtain salvation, was not denied by the apostle's mission to the Gentiles; so far as the Gentiles were converted by him, they were simply received into the saving fellowship of Israel (*c*). But that no transition through proselytism was connected with it, the apostle shows from this, that justification, on which the promise rests, was given to Abraham, when he was not yet uncircumcised, simply on the ground of faith; and thus also is salvation made accessible to the spiritual children of Abraham (*d*).

(*a*) The universality of the Christian salvation was given *à priori* to the apostle along with his entire conception of it (comp. § 58, *c*). If he started from the universal human need of δικαιοσύνη, there was in that respect no difference between Jew and Gentile. They were both without righteousness (Rom. iii. 22, 23), because they were both under the dominion of sin (ver. 9), and as such it was quite independent of the difference of pre-Christian religions, and had its original source in the general descent of all men from Adam. As God must then Himself give justification to men without their co-operation, and from free grace, because men of themselves had not and could not obtain righteousness, then the way in which He does this could be only one, as He is Himself but one (ver. 30). If one will not give up the unity of

God, then is God the God not only of the Jews, but also of the Gentiles (ver. 29), and His dealings in the way of justification, which are conditioned by Himself alone, can therefore only be alike for both. If one, on the other hand, has in his eye the new life, which has to be set up in men by grace, then that is a new creation which, over against the distinctions of pre-Christian religions, is something everywhere the same (Gal. vi. 15). This new creation is accomplished in all in the same way, by living fellowship with Christ, in which the differences of pre-Christian life vanish (Gal. iii. 8; 1 Cor. xii. 13; comp. Col. iii. 11), and the only thing of any avail is faith, which is the condition of it (Gal. v. 6). Finally, the exalted Lord, to whom the apostle was indebted for his deliverance, was not only the Messiah of the Jews, He was the universal Ruler; and it is said to be a narrowing of His κυριότης if one would not admit that He is rich enough to deliver all Jews and Gentiles without distinction, if they call upon Him in faith (Rom. x. 12; comp. ver. 14).

(*b*) But though the Christian salvation is a universal salvation, yet the position of Jews and Gentiles to it is not quite the same. The promise of this salvation was given by grace to the Jews (Gal. iii. 18); but after God had once given this promise, He thus became bound to them for its fulfilment (Rom. xv. 8; comp. § 72, *d*). Towards the Gentiles He had bound Himself by no similar promise; they could but praise the mercy of God if He pitied their need (ver. 9), if He thereby showed all the riches of His glory in that not only from among the Jews, but also from among the Gentiles, He called some to be vessels of His mercy (ix. 23, 24; comp. Eph. i. 11–14, iii. 6). But from this side also the calling of the Gentiles seems to require no special justification, as it is but a richer evidence of His mercy, which from its very nature is free and unconditioned (ver. 15). Not in the least could the Jews take offence at this; for if God had given no promise to the Gentiles themselves, yet the scriptural prophecy, which they knew and acknowledged, had in many ways taken into view the calling of the Gentiles (§ 73, *b*).

(*c*) In the prophecy of the calling of the Gentiles there was, to be sure, the presupposition throughout, that Israel should first participate in the Messianic salvation, and that

through them it should come to the Gentiles. In this presupposition Paul agrees with the first apostles (§ 43, *a*), since, according to him, salvation is appointed for the Jew first (Rom. i. 16). So long as the conversion of Gentiles remained an isolated event, and the body of the Church consisted of Jewish Christians, this prerogative of Israel remained untouched; but when, through the apostles' mission to the Gentiles, these were brought in numbers into the Church, and the whole character of the Church became preponderatingly Gentile Christian, the question must arise, how the calling of the Gentiles is to be adjusted to Israel's election—an election which even for Paul formed the inalienable pre-eminence of Judaism (§ 72, *d*). If Paul, moreover, by the way in which, according to the history of the Acts, he always turned first to the Jews, preserved in principle this prerogative of Israel (comp. Pfleiderer, p. 509 [E. T. ii. 243]), yet was it in fact thereby a little changed; the special work given to him was, according to § 89, *d*, the mission to the heathen as such, and the result of that—a result, besides, far surpassing that of all the apostles—was the formation of a Gentile Church, which before Israel, and in the place of Israel, became a sharer in the Messianic salvation. This also was to be justified to the consciousness of the Apostle of the Gentiles only in this way, that the Gentiles, though not the natural descendants of Abraham, were yet received into the saving fellowship of Israel. By an act of the divine power and goodness were the branches of the wild olive tree engrafted into the noble olive tree, whose root are the patriarchs (xi. 16–24, especially vv. 17, 22, 24; comp. Eph. ii. 11–13, 19); and thus it was Israel, as descended from them, which had received the promise, if even in the new form it had assumed through the incorporation of believing Gentiles. Yet the ideal of the theocracy is first realized in it (comp. § 44, 45), whose representative is no longer the earthly Jerusalem with her children (Gal. iv. 25), but the higher Jerusalem, which is called the Mother of Christians (ver. 26). Yet it was no such *quid pro quo*, so glib to us, but to the Israelitish consciousness quite inconceivable, by which one puts Abraham's spiritual children, without more ado, into the place of his bodily seed, by which Paul removed that difficulty. He rather

referred Gal. iii. 16, the Abrahamitic promise, to Christ, who was really the natural σπέρμα Ἀβραάμ. If, now, those who are not the natural seed of Abraham have obtained the promise given to that seed, it has come about only because they in virtue of their living fellowship with Christ have entered into union with Him, by which they cannot be excluded from the child's right of inheritance, which that seed in the original sense had obtained (vv. 28, 29, and therewith § 83, *d*, footnote 5).

(*d*) The thought, that even those who were not the bodily descendants of Abraham might come into participation in Israel's salvation, was by no means strange to Judaism (comp. § 44, *d*). All proselytes entered in this way into fellowship in the blessings of Abraham; but that fellowship was complete, to be sure, only when they accepted circumcision and the law. It was therefore but a very natural demand on the part of the Judaizers, if they required the same from the Gentiles who wished to obtain a share in the Messianic salvation. The early apostles, according to § 43, *c*, had declined this demand, and Paul could by no means yield to it, because then the Gentiles, not as such, but only after they had become Jews, were called to the Christian Church. He seeks to show, therefore, that Abraham, when he obtained justification by faith (§ 82, *b*),—and, according to Rom. iv. 13, this is the condition for obtaining the whole salvation promised him,—was yet uncircumcised (vv. 9, 10), rather he just received circumcision as the seal of justification by faith, given him in his foreskin (ver. 11). He sees in this an explicit intention of God to show that justification (and therewith the obtaining of salvation) does not depend on circumcision, but only on this, that one be like Abraham in faith, and in so far his spiritual child, whether he be circumcised or not (vv. 11, 12). Thus is the promise to be made good to the *whole* seed of Abraham, not to him only who is so on the ground of the law, in virtue of bodily descent and circumcision, but to him also who is so in this metaphorical sense (comp. § 21, *c*, footnote 1; § 83, *d*), in virtue of essential likeness to Abraham through faith (ver. 16).[1] He shows

[1] Here, therefore, when Paul conceives the σπέρμα of the Abrahamic covenant collectively, he does not by any means change the natural seed without more

similarly, Gal. iii. 2–5, that the Gentile Christians had received the gift of the Spirit on the ground of faith, as Abraham had received justification (ver. 6), that they therefore in respect of their faith are children of Abraham in a metaphorical sense (ver. 7). If he now wishes to account for the Gentiles sharing in the blessing of Abraham, he does not appeal without more ado to a child's right and a right of inheritance given in some way with this relation of metaphorical sonship, but to this, that a blessing is promised, Gen. xii. 3, to all nations in fellowship with Abraham (ver. 8), and therefore, as this promise was given to believing Abraham, only believers in fellowship with believing Abraham can be blessed (ver. 9).[2]

§ 91. *The Hardening and the Conversion of Israel.*

The rejection of Israel going hand in hand with the calling of the Gentiles, seems to be the most striking contradiction to the promise given irrevocably to this people (*a*). But God's dealings in the early history of the nation show, that with the promise given to the nation as such no security is given to each individual, naturally descended from the father, that he shall share in it (*b*). Those shut out from salvation are shut out in consequence of their stumbling at Christ, and on

ado into the spiritual (comp. note c), but he points out that the unconditional acceptance of the children of Abraham, those who are so simply in a metaphorical sense, to participation in the rights of children, is proved by the significant appointment of God with respect to the time of Abraham's justification, as also by the condition with which it is connected, and that the promise, Gen. xvii. 5, points to a fatherhood of Abraham in this larger sense, because Abraham did not become the natural father of *many* nations, ver. 17.

[2] Here, therefore, the transference of the rights of Abraham's natural children to his spiritual is expressly sought to be justified, and in this it is implied that the former rights remain essentially untouched. Pfleiderer, p. 317 [E. T. ii. 44], here seeks for an abrupt anti-Judaistic tendency; but that is excluded by the blessing uttered, Gal. vi. 16, over the Israel of God, *i.e.* over believing Israel (as the *καί* can only mean "even," comp. Hofmann *in loc.*). The slave with her son who was turned out, and was not to be heir with the son of the free woman (iv. 30 ff.), is not natural Israel, as Pfleiderer, p. 316 [E. T. ii. 43], supposes, but, according to vv. 25, 29, Israel prepossessed by legalism persecuting Christianity, *i.e.* unbelieving Israel. It is not hence any "irenical tendency" of the Epistle to the Romans, if, along with and before the spiritual children of Abraham, the natural (in so far as they are believing) obtain a share in his inheritance.

account of their inexcusable opposition to the new institution of salvation; they have through their own guilt fallen under the curse of hardening, and this, according to God's plan, must have the effect of turning the salvation withdrawn from them to the Gentiles (*c*). Nevertheless, there yet remains a remnant that has attained salvation; and even the temporary preference of the Gentiles has this object as its end, to stir up the Jews to jealousy, and so by God's mercy to lead the whole nation to salvation (*d*).

(*a*) What may have appeared the most startling fact in connection with the calling of the Gentiles, was that the casting away of Israel, at least of the greater portion of Israel, went hand in hand with it. The engrafting of the wild branches implied the breaking away of the natural branches (Rom. xi. 19). If Christian missions in the person of their most successful worker turned to the Gentiles, then the blessing of such missions would be withdrawn from the people of Israel: Paul expressly announces it as a judgment to the Jews, that the preaching of the gospel, by which the calling is realized, has been turned away from the Jews to the Gentiles (Acts xiii. 46, xxviii. 28); and the Acts of the Apostles shows on purpose how this came to pass through his missionary activity. By the withdrawal of the preaching of the gospel, however, the way to salvation was shut to them, although κατὰ φύσιν κλάδοι (Rom. xi. 24). They were yet shut out from the root and fatness of the olive tree (ver. 17), *i.e.* from the salvation promised to the fathers, in which the Gentiles had obtained a share by their being grafted in (§ 90, *c*). And yet the promise transmitted from the fathers was the inalienable possession of Israel, and they still continued to be a people beloved of God for the fathers' sake (xi. 28). God could not possibly cast away His people just because they did not behave as they ought to have done, as He had foreknown them before He chose them to be His people (ver. 2). If they were therefore unfit to receive salvation, yet God with such foreknowledge of their unfitness had chosen them to be His people; but if He had once chosen them, their unfaithfulness could not remove God's faithfulness towards His own promise (iii. 3; comp. § 72, *d*, footnote 6). God could not withdraw gifts of grace given

them, and His calling in particular (xi. 29).[1] The question of which Paul (Rom. ix.–xi.) so fully treats was from his premises a problem not easy to solve; one which much occupied his heart, moved as he was by patriotic sorrow for his fellow-countrymen (ix. 1–3, x. 1).

(*b*) That many who were descended from Abraham, and seemed on that account to have a claim on the salvation promised to the seed of Abraham, did not yet attain to that salvation, was therefore an undoubted fact. But Paul asserts, that not all those who were naturally descended from the ancestor of the nation (*πάντες οἱ ἐκ Ἰσραήλ*) formed the Israel to whom the promise was given (Rom. ix. 6); not all those who are the seed of Abraham according to the flesh have the right of children, which secures them a share in the promise given to Abraham (ver. 7). And so it is by no means to be said that the seed of Abraham, to whom the promise was given, is not to be taken in a special sense, but only that the promise given to the nation as such does not apply without more ado to each single individual who, in virtue of actual descent from the patriarchs, belongs to it, that individuals may even be left empty, if only the nation as such receives the promise.[2] Paul

[1] Beyschlag has evidently overlooked this when he says, p. 42, that it lies in the very idea of free mercy, that there is nothing it gives less ground for than a claim of right for all time coming, that it can be withdrawn again from those who have once received it. But the divine mercy is no doubt free in the selection of its objects (Rom. ix. 15); but to whomsoever God has once bound Himself by a promise, to him He must ever keep it. Paul traces back the mission of Christ to Israel to God's faithfulness, according to which He was bound to keep His promise given to the fathers (xv. 8; comp. Pfleiderer, 314 f. [E. T. ii. 41]). If in the election of the individual no such irrevocableness exists (§ 88, *d*), that is accounted for in this way, that the free conduct of the individual is simply incalculable, and is not conditioned for all time coming by what is historically known of its quality. Even on this account we will see how even the election of Israel gives no security to the individual members of the nation that they will attain the end of that election.

[2] That this is thought quite in the tenor of the Old Testament promise, is clear from this, that the prophets ever keep firm hold of the realization of the promise to the nation, just as they threaten many individuals with destruction in the divine judgments which precede pre-Messianic times (comp. § 42, *c*; 44, *c*). When Beyschlag, p. 29, and Schenkel, p. 273, on the other hand, assert that, according to Paul, the promise is fulfilled to the spiritual Israel (of Jews and Gentiles mingled), that is again only that *quid pro quo* which would have spared the apostle and us all those reasonings brought forward (§ 90, *c*, *d*), had it occurred to him. If Paul says (Rom. ii. 25) the circumcision which does not

proves this by two examples drawn from the early history of the nation. Abraham had two sons of his own body, and yet he only who was born according to the promise was counted as σπέρμα, and received the rights of a child of God (ix. 7–9). And if one were here to say that Isaac is the son of the lawful wife, but Ishmael is not of equal birth, and is thus from his conduct cut off from the inheritance, then Esau and Jacob were heirs of one father and of one mother, and yet God determined even before their birth, before, therefore, they had done anything, that the elder should serve the younger, and the latter alone thus should receive the full rights of a child (vv. 10–12). If even now, therefore, not all who are descended from Abraham obtain the salvation, if God even now reserves to Himself to determine which of the descendants of the patriarch are to receive the rights of children, and if in this determination He does not in the least ask for their good works, but only works faith in individuals from among Israel, and this leads these to obtain salvation, He thus acts only as He acted in the early history of the people, when before the birth of the children, and without reference to their conduct (ver. 11), He determined their fate. Thus far now the early dealings of God is the best interpreter of the sense in which He has given the promise to the seed of Abraham, and thus Paul can rightfully assert that this promise has not come to be without effect (ver. 6), even though many single individuals are excluded from salvation.

(c) It might seem unrighteous if God, without any regard to the unquestionable striving after righteousness (Rom. ix. 31, x. 2) on the part of Abraham's natural posterity, a striving which distinguished them from the Gentiles, yet denied to them the grace effectual to lead to salvation, and called the

keep the law becomes uncircumcision, that does not mean that "the godless Jew is even on that account denationalized;" for then, since *all* the Jews had not kept the law, the question he had discussed (Rom. ix.-xi.) had lost its importance, as there was no Jew not denationalized, therefore no longer Jews in contradistinction to the Gentiles. Rather the context makes it evident that the question discussed is, whether the circumcised *as such* had any advantage above the Gentiles in reference to justification before God. And (Rom. xi. 17) it is the ideal theocracy that is thought of, into which the Gentiles are received, but which ever grows from the root o the patriarchs, which is therefore looked at with evident reference to the nationa basis.

Gentiles in their stead, though they were not striving in the least after righteousness (ix. 30).[3] But their guilt consisted in this simply, that they sought after righteousness by works (vv. 31, 32), and so wished to set up their own righteousness, instead of submitting themselves to the new rule of righteousness (x. 3), after that the end of the law had come with Christ (ver. 4), and the righteousness of faith had come in the place of a righteousness by works (vv. 5–13). They could not excuse themselves by saying that they had not heard the message (of this new righteousness), for it had gone into all the world (ver. 18); nor by saying that they had not understood it, for even the unintelligent Gentiles had quite well understood it (vv. 19, 20). Rather they had been disobedient to the gospel, which required their acceptance and faith on the salvation presented thereby (ver. 16), because, as the prophet had already described them (Isa. lxv. 2), they are a disobedient and stubborn people (ver. 21; comp. xv. 31: *οἱ ἀπειθοῦντες*). But the deeper cause of this disobedience was, that they stumbled at the Messiah announced in the gospel (ix. 32), because the crucified One was no Messiah in their view (1 Cor. i. 23). They had not therefore wished to seek salvation by faith on Him (Rom. ix. 32), but had stumbled on the stone of offence (xi. 11), and now hardening had come upon them as a judgment, as the prophets had already described (xi. 7–10), and as Paul sees it foreshadowed in the

[3] Paul no doubt in the first place, according to § 88, *b*, simply puts down this thought by saying that it infringes upon the absolute right the Creator has over His creature (ix. 20, 21); but even there he points out that the Jews at least have no occasion to quarrel thus with God, inasmuch as He had by no means availed Himself of that absolute right towards them, but, notwithstanding that they were as vessels of wrath ripe for destruction, had yet with much long-suffering borne with them (ver. 22), in order to lead them to repentance (ii. 4). It was thus there pointed out that the Jews had contracted a heavy load of guilt, by which they were exposed to God's wrath and destruction. The passible interpretation, that Paul (ix. 30 ff.) puts himself suddenly on an entirely different standpoint, and that thus with him "an objective theological and a subjective anthropological mode of viewing the matter proceed irreconcilably side by side" (comp. however, Pfleiderer, p. 248 [E. T. i. 250]), is not therefore confirmed. He rather now proceeds to show what then is the guilt on account of which God has shut out the greater number of the descendants of Abraham from salvation, and then it is proved afresh that this does not in any way lie in a lack of a service of works, as the Gentiles had not confessedly even once tried to win any such.

veil with which Moses hid from the people the fading of the glory on his countenance, *i.e.* here the transitoriness of the glory of the covenant of the law (2 Cor. iii. 13–15; comp. § 73, *d*). And now Israel, bound in legal obedience and persecuting Christianity, is shut out from fellowship in the salvation (Gal. iv. 25–31; comp. § 90, *d*, footnote 2). But this hardening, and the exclusion from salvation connected with it, has come to them through their own guilt; *τῇ ἀπιστίᾳ ἐξεκλάσθησαν* (Rom. xi. 20).[4] The ultimate intention of God, according to note *a*, in this judgment of hardening cannot possibly be the fall, *i.e.* the ruin of the nation; rather God has made use of human sin in order to carry out His saving purposes towards the Gentiles: the gospel rejected by the Jews has been brought to the Gentiles, and their deliverance thereby rendered possible (ver. 11: *τῷ αὐτῶν παραπτώματι ἡ σωτηρία τοῖς ἔθνεσιν*). In order to make room for the engrafting of the branches of the wild olive tree, the natural branches were broken off (ver. 19); for the sake of the Gentiles, those who are the beloved of God have come to be the enemies of God (ver. 28; comp. § 80, *d*, footnote 13); through their disobedience it has come to pass that God's mercy has been turned to the Gentiles (ver. 30). And thus the transgressions of Israel, or rather the divine judgment which is accomplished on Israel by their transgressions, has become the riches of the Gentiles; the loss suffered by the former by their exclusion from salvation has become riches for the Gentiles (ver. 12); the casting away of the one has been the reconciling of the other (ver. 15).

(*d*) The hardening of Israel which has presently come

[4] Quite thus does Peter teach that the Israelites, continuing in unbelief, are rooted out from among the elect people, since Messiah has become to them a stone of offence and stumbling (§ 44, *c*). To be sure, God Himself works faith in those who are coming to believe, but yet only in so far as He foreknew in them the condition suitable for such working of faith, according to § 88, *d*, and they were elected on the ground of this. And so unbelief remains, even when it is evoked by hardening by way of judgment; yet self-condemned, so far as this happens to the perversity of the present Jewish mode of thinking, because it makes the nation unreceptive of the work of divine grace. God even punishes sin by sin (comp. § 70, *d*), while in the people, who, according to their whole present nature *do not wish*, yield to the will of God, the offer of the gospel does not only not work a willingness to believe, it even works opposition, so that finally they *cannot* believe.

about is yet experienced by the nation only partially (Rom. xi. 25: ἀπὸ μέρος). The number of those shut out from salvation may be ever so great as they will, so great that one may henceforward speak of the hardening of Israel, *i.e.* of the nation as to the majority of its members (ver. 7), but there still always remains a remnant; and that only a remnant of Israel is delivered in the circumstances is what Isaiah has already predicted (ix. 27–29).[5] But the hope of the apostle for his own nation does not continue to rest on them. The calling of the Gentiles, which became possible through the casting away of Israel, has for its object, not only to make the Gentiles partakers of salvation; it also points as its final result to provoke the Jews to jealousy (xi. 11: εἰς τὸ παραζηλῶσαι αὐτούς), and thus to reach by an indirect way God's saving purpose towards His chosen people. With all the zeal with which the discharge of his own peculiar calling lay on the Apostle of the Gentiles, he yet kept before his eye as the ultimate end, through the realization of salvation on the part of converted Gentiles, to stir up to jealousy his countrymen, whose deliverance is his most fervent wish and his constant prayer (x. 1; comp. ix. 3), and so to save some of them (xi. 13, 14). From this it is clear that even the judgment of hardening, passed on those members of the nation cast away for the present, is not final, and it by no means of itself hands them over to destruction (ver. 11); it rather leaves them room for that repentance which, in consequence of the new wondrous leading of God, may even yet quite well come.[6] As soon as they turn to the Lord, the blinding

[5] Even in the history of Elias it was foreshadowed, that even at a time when all seemed lost, God had yet reserved a remnant of 7000, who had not bowed the knee to Baal (xi. 2-4). And were there but himself, the Apostle of the Gentiles, this Israelite of purest birth (ver. 1), who formed the remnant, then the proof lay before their eyes that God had not cast away the people as such (ver. 2). But even yet there abides a remnant, which His grace has selected (ver. 5); and works are as little taken into account in their election (ver. 6) as in the hardening of the others (note *c*), and this remnant has obtained salvation (ver. 7): it is they, therefore, who, according to note *b*, are appointed to be that portion of the natural σπέρμα which are to receive the full rights of children, as Isaac among Abraham's, and Jacob among Isaac's sons; they are the Israel of God (Gal. vi. 16; comp. § 90, *d*, footnote 2) in opposition to Israel after the flesh (1 Cor. x. 18).

[6] From what Paul has explained of the possibility, even the certainty, of the

veil, which now lies upon their hearts, will be taken away from them (2 Cor. iii. 16), and then they, through the same mercy of God which the Gentiles have now obtained, will obtain mercy (Rom. xi. 31). As soon as they cease to be unbelieving, those branches that have been broken of will be again grafted in; yes, it is at any rate relatively easier to re-engraft the natural branches, than it was to engraft the branches of the wild olive tree into the noble one; and He who was able to do the one, is all the more able to do the other (vv. 23, 24). And this ultimate deliverance of Israel is not only possible, it is to the apostle certain, because of the divine promise (vv. 26, 27),—as certain as the election of the people as such, which sprang from the patriarchs, and the calling to salvation therein involved, cannot be repented of (vv. 28, 29).[7] When the full number of the Gentiles shall have entered into the fellowship of the elect people, then shall all Israel be saved (vv. 25, 26). As little, to be sure, as that entrance of the fulness of the Gentiles excludes the idea that individuals may remain in unbelief, or by falling away may draw down upon themselves the judgment of a

conversion of the Israel presently hardened, one must by no means draw general dogmatic conclusions as to the nature of the election (comp. on the other hand, § 88, *a*, footnote 3), as this rests on the entirely peculiar election of Israel *as a nation*. To be sure, there is here no contradiction to Paul's doctrine of election elsewhere. The ultimate conversion of Israel comes about as little without the working of God's grace, as conversion does anywhere else, the grace which is here perfected by the wonderful leading of God, in which He, according to His faithfulness to His promise, so long follows after the members of His chosen people, who are now hardened, until He succeeds in working in the nation that susceptibility presently awanting, on the ground of which they finally believe. That this must ultimately succeed depends on this, that God has foreknown (xi. 2) the nation as of such a character that in spite of their obstinate resistance they can yet ultimately be won as a people.

[7] At the time of the great split between him and his nation, in which Paul expected the final falling away of Judaism and the rise of Antichrist from their midst (§ 63, *b*, *c*), he had not ventured to entertain this hope, and we have seen that he knew how to reconcile it with the promise, even though only a remnant of Israel, however small it might even be, should be saved. But now he has come back to the hope of the early apostles, of a conversion of Israel as a whole (§ 42). To be sure, it is not so that, according to the institution of God as originally intended, and for whose fulfilment, moreover, the first apostles laboured, Israel should be first converted, in order that then from them salvation might come to the Gentiles. Through their guilt a partial and temporary casting away of Israel has taken place, in consequence of which salvation has already now and first come to the Gentiles.

second exclusion (vv. 20–22), so little does the deliverance of all Israel exclude the idea that individual members may remain unconverted, and fall under condemnation (note *b*). But it will then be no longer the case, as at present, that a small remnant of delivered ones shall stand opposed to Israel in its majority rejected (ver. 7), but Israel as a people, according to the promise, will be converted and delivered.[8]

CHAPTER IX.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH.

§ 92. *The Church and the Gifts of Grace.*

Of the Jews and Gentiles that have been called, there is formed a new community, the Church of God, in which God dwells by His Spirit, and which, in virtue of its really living fellowship with Christ, forms His body (*a*). With a view to the further upbuilding of the Church, her organism is furnished with a manifold variety of members, by means of the different gifts of grace, among which prophecy is the most important for this end (*b*). Along with this Paul mentions the gift of teaching in its various forms, simple exhortation, speaking with tongues, along with the gift of interpretation

[8] Paul praises the wonderful ways of the divine wisdom (Rom. xi. 33–36), which has made it possible that the sins of men, which seem to thwart the plan of their salvation, must help directly to realize it in a yet more comprehensive way, while the calling of the Gentiles has even now been incorporated with it. The temporary hardening of Israel has brought it about, that salvation has even already come from the Jews to the Gentiles; and this must finally only serve this end, that salvation will come back from the Gentiles to the Jews, and thus the promise of the elect nation will be perfectly fulfilled. Yea, finally, this method of fulfilment must contribute to the making known more gloriously the divine mercy. Had Israel presently become believing, then had they received the salvation, as God was bound by His faithfulness to fulfil the promise to them (xv. 8). But now by their disobedience they have put themselves on an equality with the former Gentiles, and forfeited the fulfilment of the promise; on the other hand, His simple mercy remains for them, the mercy which has realized salvation to the Jew as to the Gentile in spite of their disobedience (xi. 30–32; comp. ix. 23, 24),—even He Himself exercises it on the ground of fidelity to His promise (vv. 28, 29).

and the gift of miracle-working faith (*c*). If Paul mentions also the gift of service and of government, that does not exclude the idea that the possessors of these gifts were commissioned to use them officially; the conduct of the apostle, however, in reference to the organization of the churches, does not seem to have been quite uniform throughout (*d*).

(*a*) The distinctions of the pre-Christian religious fellowships are removed by living fellowship with Christ (§ 90, *a*), and thus over against those fellowships a new fellowship is formed of Christians; and this is expressly designated, 1 Cor. x. 32, as the ἐκκλησία τοῦ Θεοῦ, consisting of Jews and Greeks.[1] This fellowship therefore belongs in a special sense to God; for it has come into existence through the fact that God chose each individual; and by the power to work faith which He has given to the preaching of the word among them, He called each, *i.e.* gave him entrance into the fellowship,[2] and it consists clearly of such as have been consecrated (§ 84, *d*) by the participation of the Spirit in baptism, or as have become ἅγιοι. But while the Spirit of God dwells in all the members of the Church, and with Him God Himself, He consecrates not only the body of each individual (1 Cor.

[1] Although in the LXX. the national community of Israel is designated as the ἐκκλησία simply (Acts vii. 38), and in conformity with this in the words of Jesus, the particular fellowship of His disciples (§ 31, *b*), with Paul this name scarcely corresponds with the idea that he saw in the Christian Church the true Israel (§ 90, *c*). With him the expression ἐκκλησία does not designate primarily the collective community, but, conformably with classical usage, it is used for the national assembly (Acts xix. 32, 39, 41), the assembly of Church members (1 Cor. xi. 18, xiv. 28, 35), as these are to be met with in any definite place (ἡ κατ' οἶκον ἐκκλησία: 1 Cor. xvi. 19; Rom. xvi. 5; comp. Col. iv. 15; Philem. 2). Then a single congregation is called ἐκκλησία, as Jas. v. 14, *i.e.* the collective body of Christians in any definite city (ἡ ἐκκλησία ἡ οὖσα ἐν Κορίνθῳ: 1 Cor. i. 2; 2 Cor. i. 1; Rom. xvi. 1; comp. ἡ ἐκκλησία Θεσσαλονικέων: 1 Thess. i. 1; 2 Thess. i. 1; Col. iv. 16), or in a country (αἱ ἐκκλησίαι τῆς Γαλατίας: Gal. i. 2; 1 Cor. xvi. 1; comp. Gal. i. 22; 1 Cor. xvi. 19; 2 Cor. viii. 1; 1 Thess. ii. 14: ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ). Yet the expression already occurs to denote the collective community of Christians (1 Cor. xii. 28). There is implied in the expression ἐκκλησία nothing to designate the Christian fellowship as such. This takes place only by the addition of τοῦ Θεοῦ,—an addition which characterizes at times the single community (1 Cor. i. 2, xi. 16, 22; 2 Cor. i. 1; comp. 1 Thess. ii. 14; 2 Thess. i. 4), sometimes the collective community (Gal. i. 13; 1 Cor. x. 32, xv. 9), as a community belonging to God.

[2] Hence Paul naturally looks upon all the members of the Church as elected and called; and, according to § 88, *d*, that by no means excludes the idea that

vi. 19), but also the Church herself (iii. 16; comp. Eph. ii. 21, 22) to be His temple, which, as such, is holy (ver. 17).[3] By participation in the Spirit all the individual members of the Church are, according to § 84, *b*, put into a real living fellowship with Christ (1 Cor. i. 2: *ἡ ἐκκλησία τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἁγιασμένοι ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ*), and it depends on this directly, according to Gal. iii. 28, that all who have put on Christ in baptism (ver. 27) have put off all the distinctive marks of pre-Christian religious fellowships, and are become one (comp. vi. 15). By this living fellowship especially all are equally connected with a living centre, and so have become one organism (*σῶμα*), in which each member stands in living fellowship with every other, each member is serviceable to the whole, and so also to each individual (Rom. xii. 5: *οἱ πολλοὶ ἓν σῶμά ἐσμεν ἐν Χριστῷ ὁ δὲ καθ' εἷς ἀλλήλων μέλη*).[4] But while Christ by this living fellowship rules each individual by His Spirit, and thus makes use of their *σώματα* for the performance of His own ends, they also may be designated, 1 Cor. vi. 15, His members. As, now, the natural body is a unity, and yet has many members, but all the individual members, although they are many, yet form a single body; so

they may yet fall away. Were a member of the Church to become guilty of gross sins, or of persistent disobedience to the apostolic commands, then every blessed fellowship with him is broken off (1 Cor. v. 11; comp. 2 Thess. iii. 14), without there being at the same time any giving up of anxious efforts to bring Him to repentance (2 Thess. iii. 15). Hence especially the rule meant by Paul to have a disciplinary effect on the incestuous person (1 Cor. v. 5). That person was eventually formally thrust out of the Church (vv. 2, 13) till he repented (2 Cor. ii. 6–8).

[3] For Paul also as for Peter (§ 45 *a*) the prophecy of God's dwelling in the midst of His people (comp. Lev. xxvi. 11, 12) is perfectly fulfilled only in the Christian Church (2 Cor. vi. 16); but Paul has explicitly realized for himself this early apostolic idea by reflection on the possession of the Spirit by the Christian, and he has thus set it in closer connection with his doctrine of salvation.

[4] By baptism, which transplants into this living fellowship, are all, Jews and Gentiles, baptized into one body (1 Cor. xii. 13). In another way the organic unity of the many is effected by the bread in the Lord's Supper, which transplants into fellowship with Christ (more exactly with the body of Christ broken for us) (x. 17; comp. § 85, *c*, footnote 5); and from this side one may say that Paul sees in the Lord's Supper, as he does also in baptism, a constitutive moment for the true nature of the Church. But this way of looking at it is nowhere else carried farther by the apostle, and therefore it is not fit to connect the doctrine of the sacraments with the doctrine of the Church (comp. § 85, *a*, footnote 1).

is it with Christ (xii. 12). He also has many members, but these many members form but one body; and thus far the organic unity of the Church may be designated as the body of Christ, whose members individual Christians are (ver. 27).[5]

(*b*) It is implied in the nature of the Christian Church, that it must continually be extending externally more and more, and that in each individual member of it the new life quickened on his reception, *i.e.* at his baptism, must be even more perfectly being realized on all sides. In this respect it is a field belonging to God, in which Paul and his fellow-labourers work uninterruptedly, a building belonging to Him on which they have continually to build (1 Cor. iii. 9). The foundation-stone of this building has been laid once for all by God (ver. 11), in that He has made Jesus to be the Messiah, and therefore the corner-stone of the perfected theocracy (comp. already § 38 *c*; 50, *a*); but by the preaching of Christ, which works faith and founds churches, it is being ever afresh laid as the foundation of each individual church (ver. 10; Rom. xv. 20; comp. Eph. ii. 20). Every advance of the Church in its extension, or in the development of her life, is, following out this idea, an upbuilding (*οἰκοδομή*: 1 Cor. xiv. 12, 26; 2 Cor. x. 8, xiii. 10: *οἰκοδομεῖν*: 1 Cor. xiv. 4).[6] As, now, the founding of the Church is brought about only in this way, that God by His Spirit works in the apostles the gifts of grace needed for the preaching of the gospel which works faith (§ 89, *c*), so its upbuilding also can be brought about only by a similar working of God, and this similarly

[5] In our Epistles Christ is not yet expressly designated the head of this body; for when, in 1 Cor. xi. 3, He is spoken of as the head of the man, that designates only His lordship generally as our "Head." And this is the result of that *κυριότης*, which He has won by His death (§ 76 *a*; 81, *b*). But this is not explicitly applied to the Church herself as such. But that, in opposition to the later Epistles, Christ is here presented as the Spirit animating the body, as has been often asserted of late (yet comp. Pfleiderer, p. 374 [E. T. ii. 103]), cannot certainly be proven. On the other hand, the idea is already indicated (2 Cor. xi. 2) that the Church is Christ's bride, and it is the task of the apostle to present her to Him as a chaste virgin (with a view to the marriage union with her at His coming) (comp. Rom. vii. 4: *εἰς τὸ γενέσθαι ὑμᾶς ἑτέρῳ, scil.* *ἀνδρί*).

[6] This biblical expression has become so common to the apostle, that, without thinking of its origin, he transfers it to the advancement of the Christian life in the individual (1 Cor. viii. 10, xiv. 4, 17; 2 Cor. xii. 19; Rom. xiv. 19, xv. 2; Eph. iv. 29; comp. § 86, *d*).

comes from the Spirit, which the individual member of the Church has; and He is manifested in this, that He gives to each individual a gift for the benefit of the Church (xii. 7). These gifts of grace (*χαρίσματα*: vii. 7; Rom. xii. 6; comp. Eph. iv. 7), *i.e.* capabilities, which the one Spirit gives (1 Cor. xii. 4, 11), or in which the one gracious gift of the Spirit is specialized according to the various positions of the individual, will be very manifold, corresponding to the nature of the organism (*σῶμα*). For it is of the nature of an organism to have not only a uniform connection with a living centre (note *a*), but a vigorous diversity of members (vv. 14, 19, 20), each of which has its special activity (Rom. xii. 4).[7] But the single object of all these gifts, with the exception of the apostleship (1 Cor. xii. 28), is the upbuilding of the Church by means of them: *πάντα πρὸς οἰκοδομὴν γενέσθω* (xiv. 26). In particular is this the object of *προφητεία* (xiv. 3, 4), which appears (xii. 28 and Rom. xii. 6) to be the highest of all the gifts next to the apostleship (comp. 1 Thess. v. 20). The gift of trying the spirits seems to have been as a rule connected with the gift of prophecy (1 Cor. xiv. 29); and it, too, stands forth as a special gift (xii. 10), and (1 Thess. v. 21) is in a certain sense required of the whole Church. It had to do with determining whether the higher inspiration which filled the prophets was of divine or of daemonic origin (2 Thess. ii. 2, and therewith § 62, *d*).[8]

(*c*) Near to the prophets stood the teachers (1 Cor. xii. 28),

[7] The ultimate author of these gifts is naturally God Himself, who has given to each (1 Cor. iii. 5), and ever according to the measure of faith (Rom. xii. 3), and now works the various powers effectual in each (1 Cor. xii. 6: *ἐνεργήματα*), by which service is done to Christ as the one Lord (ver. 5: *διακονίαι*), whose dearest interest is the upbuilding of the Church. But because they are communicated by His Spirit (Gal. iii. 5: *ὁ ἐπιχορηγῶν ὑμῖν τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ ἐνεργῶν δυνάμεις ἐν ὑμῖν*), these gifts are called *πνευματικά* (1 Cor. xii. 1, xiv. 1, 37; comp. § 84, *a*, footnote 3). There is hereby no distinction between natural gifts and gifts of miracles in the narrower sense. All these gifts are simply gifts of a higher source, even though in their distribution to individuals regard is had in general to their natural aptitudes and susceptibility.

[8] The content of the prophetic word may be for reproof (1 Cor. xiv. 24, 25), exhortation, comfort (ver. 3), and instruction (ver. 31); the essential point about it is that it results from an impulse of the Spirit (ver. 30: *ἐὰν ἄλλῳ ἀποκαλυφθῇ*). The prophet nevertheless has his spiritual life, when quickened by the Spirit of God, so far under his own control, that he can cease speaking when another begins to prophesy (vv. 30–32), and this the apostle explicitly

who were moreover capable, without special inspiration of the Spirit, to instruct the Church (xiv. 26: *διδαχή*; Rom. xii. 7: *διδασκαλία*). Their words would be, then, according to 1 Cor. xii. 8, along with the *λόγος σοφίας* (see footnote 8), the *λόγος γνώσεως*, as also, xiii. 2, *γνῶσις* stands along with the knowledge of *μυστήρια*; yet *λαλεῖν ἐν γνώσει* is distinguished from *λαλεῖν ἐν διδαχῇ*, xiv. 6, and hence it appears to have been a sort of instruction which opens up a knowledge of the saving truths which goes deeper than the ordinary instruction. Just so (Rom. xii. 8) exhortation appears alongside of prophecy, and it therefore contains within itself a moment peculiar to the prophetic word (1 Cor. xiv. 3, 31), only that it, too, was exercised, not on the ground of a special impulse imparted by the Spirit, but on the ground of a general capacity wrought by the Spirit. The speaking with tongues, so highly prized at Corinth, was, according to incidental hints of the apostle (1 Cor. xiv.), a prayer uttered in a state of ecstasy (*πνεύματι*: vv. 2, 14), quite incomprehensible to the hearers (vv. 2, 7–11, 16), which therefore consisted of disconnected exclamations, perhaps even of inarticulate sounds (comp. especially ver. 9), by which the tongue, moved by the Spirit, appears to be alone active (*λαλεῖν γλώσσῃ*: vv. 2, 4, 18, 27; *διὰ τῆς γλώσσης*: ver. 9; *ἐν γλώσσῃ*: ver. 19).[9] Sometimes

requires by way of commandment (ver. 33). Also, not more than two or three prophets are to come forward in succession in the Christian assembly (ver. 29). Along with *λαλεῖν ἐν προφητείᾳ* Paul mentions (1 Cor. xiv. 6) also *λαλεῖν ἐν ἀποκαλύψει*, and he similarly distinguishes *ἀποκάλυψιν ἔχειν* from *ψαλμὸν ἔχειν* (ver. 26); and this latter can be nothing else than a sort of prophetic speech in poetic form, just like the former. No doubt that prophetic speech rests on an *ἀποκάλυψις* (ver. 30); but Paul seems here to be specially thinking of the revelation of *μυστήρια*, the knowledge of which is also mentioned (xiii. 2), along with prophecy, as something special. This knowledge of the mysteries revealed by God through His Spirit (ii. 10) is now, according to vv. 6, 7, the substance of the Christian *σοφία* (comp. Eph. i. 17); and so it may be called the *λόγος σοφίας*, mentioned among the gifts of the Spirit in xii. 8, which discloses these mysteries to the Church, and is not the simple exposition of the elementary truths of the faith (Pfleiderer, p. 233 [E. T. i. 235]). According to 1 Cor. ii. 9, Paul includes therein mainly eschatological mysteries, such as xv. 51; Rom. xi. 25; and he seems thereby to have distinguished prediction in the narrower sense from prophecy, because in the latter it is the formation, in the former it is the whole contents as well, which springs from *ἀποκάλυψις*.

[9] There are different forms of the gift of tongues (*γένη γλωσσῶν*: xii. 10, 28; *λαλεῖν γλώσσαις*: xii. 30, xiii. 1, xiv. 5, 6, 23, 39; comp. Acts x. 46, xix. 6; *γλώσσαι ἔχειν*; 1 Cor. xiv. 26), of which doubtless one may find an indication in the

the gift of the interpretation of tongues was joined with it (vv. 5, 13, 27, 28); in particular, one who spoke with tongues seems to have understood another speaking with a tongue (ver. 16). Yet the ἑρμηνεία γλωσσῶν is presented as a special gift (xii. 10, 30). On this account the apostle will allow the exercise of this gift in the Church assembly only when an interpreter is present, and even then only in restricted measure (xiv. 27, 28). Among the practical gifts (xii. 9), the most important was the gift of πίστις, *i.e.* of a miracle-working confidence on God (§ 82, *c*, footnote 10), and this, xiii. 2, is characterized as removing mountains (comp. Matt. xvii. 20). From these there are distinguished also the χαρίσματα ἰαμάτων, *i.e.* the gifts of healing diseases of different kinds, or in different ways, and the ἐνεργήματα δυνάμεων, by which we are no doubt specially to think of the casting out of devils (comp. also Pfleiderer, p. 230 [E. T. i. 231]). But as these both appear (xii. 28–30) without the gift of faith, and, *vice versa*, the gift of faith (xiii. 2) without them, it is suggested that only the different forms of the faith which works miracles is seen in them.

(*d*) One activity of the gift of service (Rom. xii. 7) was at any rate helps (ἀντιλήψεις: 1 Cor. xii. 28), with which was connected the μεταδιδόναι and the ἐλεεῖν (Rom. xii. 8), if it is not to be referred exclusively to almsgiving and the care of the sick. Finally, Paul names, 1 Cor. xii. 28, the gift of Church leadership (κυβερνήσεις), if, to be sure, all προϊστάμενοι (Rom. xii. 8), and those who in different relations were to preside over the whole, could not exercise these gifts. That Paul regards service and government as gifts of the Spirit, does not of itself naturally exclude the idea, that those so gifted were entrusted even officially with the corresponding duty. If Paul with Barnabas appointed elders (Acts xiv. 23) in the churches founded on their first missionary journey, where, on account of the dative, one can scarcely think of their simply taking the lead in the election

distinction between προσεύχεσθαι and ψάλλειν (ver. 15). To the unlearned or the heathen, one speaking with tongues seemed light as a visionary (ver. 23; comp. Acts ii. 13). To speak with tongues could be of service only for self-edification (xiv. 4); but to the Church it brought no fruit of edification (ver. 17), and it was at most a σημεῖον for the non-Christian (vv. 21, 22).

of the congregation, and there is no need to do so according to x. 41, then it has no doubt to be considered that that journey was not undertaken by him independently, and that those churches continued even in other relations dependent on the mother Church (Acts xvi. 4; comp. § 43, *c*, footnote 2). In the churches of Galatia and Corinth we find no trace of officials leaders (nor also 1 Cor. xvi. 15; comp. Pfleiderer, p. 231 [E. T. i. 232]); even the disorders which had crept into the latter, and the way the apostle never makes their leaders responsible for them and for their removal, absolutely exclude the existence of such. On the other hand, the Macedonian churches appear to have had official leaders and helpers (1 Thess. v. 12: *προϊστάμενοι*; comp. Phil. i. 1: *ἐπίσκοποι καὶ διάκονοι*), and in the seaport city of Corinth we find (Rom. xvi. 1) a deaconess. 1 Cor. xiv., mention cannot be made simply of a peculiar office of teaching.

§ 93. *Church Duties.*

If the diversity of gifts is to co-operate beneficially, there is need of Christian modesty, which continues conscious of the place of each single gift in the organism of the Church, as also of the relative value of the gifts generally, and which is rooted ultimately in humility (*a*). But the first most fundamental Christian virtue continues to be love to the brethren, and towards all men, and even towards enemies (*b*). One special exercise of Christian love is required by the difference of opinion as to partaking of flesh offered in sacrifice to idols, as also about the exercises of self-restraint, and practices which the apostle held to be indifferent, but which were to a portion of the Church matters of conscience (*c*). Here the apostle requires that one in his different actions acknowledge his reciprocal obligations, and that he who feels himself free, shall in self-denying love give up that freedom in order that he may give no offence to the weaker brethren (*d*).

(*a*) From the variety of endowments, it arises as the first of Christian duties, that no one thinks more highly of himself than he ought to think; that each keeps in due restraint his estimation of himself (Rom. xii. 3; comp. 1 Cor. iv. 9); and

that, on the other hand, the measure of honour be given to each which belongs to him according to his gifts and his position in the Church (Rom. xii. 10, xiii. 7; comp. Phil. ii. 3; Eph. v. 21). As the organism of the Church requires the smaller gifts as well as the higher, no one is to despise the value of the gifts given him (1 Cor. xii. 15–18), and no one, moreover, is to despise those who have received smaller gifts than himself (vv. 21–26). No one is to seek to be more highly gifted than he is, no one is to aim at high things (Rom. xii. 16). Above all things, no one is to over-estimate the value of his own gifts; for without love, which puts them entirely at the service of the Church, and turns them to the best account, they are all worthless (1 Cor. xiii. 1–3); they may even become dangerous, if they puff up the individual (viii. 1: *ἡ γνῶσις φυσιοῖ*). They are all, moreover, transitory (xiii. 8), because they are only imperfect, and therefore cease when the perfect comes (vv. 9–12). Christian modesty, however, grows out of humility, which will not be wise in its own conceits (Rom. xii. 16; comp. xi. 25), which does not imagine itself to be something (Gal. vi. 3), which knows that it has nothing it has not received (1 Cor. iv. 7), and that the entire gracious institution of Christianity is planned to exclude every ground of human boasting (Rom. iii. 27; 1 Cor. i. 29, iii. 21; 2 Cor. x. 17). Thus humility is here, as in the teaching of Jesus and of Peter (§ 25, *d*; 47, *a*), one of the two cardinal virtues, only that it is here presented in the form of modesty, as a duty to the Church.

(*b*) If the gifts are transitory, love in its very nature is, on the other hand, imperishable (1 Cor. xiii. 8). If the gifts may through misuse become dangerous, it is, on the other hand, implied in the very nature of love that it is directed for the advancement of spiritual life in others (viii. 1: *ἡ ἀγάπη οἰκοδομεῖ*; comp. xiii. 4: *οὐ φυσιοῦται*). If gifts without love are worthless, then this love must be the rule for striving after higher gifts (xii. 31, xiv. 1, 39); those gifts are to be considered the highest which contribute most to the advancement of the Church (comp. 1 Cor. xiv., especially vv. 5, 12). In this relation love is, so far, more valuable than faith and hope (xiii. 13); for these, so far, have significance for the individual life of the Christian, but the former for the life of

the Church.[1] Love is the source of all the virtues (vv. 4–7), the first-fruits of the Spirit (Gal. v. 22), by which, therefore, faith, which conditions participation in the Spirit, proves itself effectual (ver. 6). Love, and that unfeigned (2 Cor. vi. 6), stands therefore first, Rom. xii. 9, among all the exhortations, and comprehends them all (1 Cor. xvi. 14). By this is meant, in the first place, brotherly love (Rom. xii. 10: *ἡ φιλαδελφία ἡ εἰς ἀλλήλους*; comp. 1 Thess. iv. 9, 10), *i.e.* love towards fellow-believers (Gal. vi. 10); for, on account of this love, which binds them to each other, the Christians call themselves brethren (§ 83, *a*, footnote 2). It is preserved by unity of views (1 Cor. i. 10) and of effort (Rom. xv. 5; 2 Cor. xiii. 11: *τὸ αὐτὸ φρονεῖν*), in particular by uniform concern for the best interests of others (Rom. xii. 16); and this establishes the peace of unanimity (1 Cor. xiii. 11), and wards off divisions (1 Cor. i. 10, xi. 18, xii. 25). It is shown in mutual sympathy (1 Cor. xii. 26; Rom. xii. 15), in active helpfulness (Rom. xii. 13, xvi. 2), and this Paul expressly requires by his collection for Jerusalem (1 Cor. xvi.; 2 Cor. viii. 9; Rom. xv. 25–28), and in intercession (2 Cor. i. 11; Rom. i. 10, xv. 30). But, according to § 62, *b*, it is to be extended to all men. Hence Paul exhorts to keep peace with all men, so much, and so long, as it is possible for us (Rom. xii. 18); to it, according to § 25, *c*, 47, *a*; 56, *d*, meekness belongs (Gal. v. 23; comp. vi. 1), which does not grow bitter on account of the wrong another has done to us (*οὐ παροξύνεται*), but imputes not the evil (1 Cor. xiii. 5); further, it seeks not to revenge itself, but to overcome evil with good (Rom. xii. 19–21), and to bless the persecutor (ver. 14; 1 Cor. iv. 12, 13; comp. Matt. v. 44). Love in its very nature is long-suffering (1 Cor. xiii. 4; 1 Thess. v. 14: *μακροθυμεῖ*; comp. Gal. v. 22; 2 Cor. vi. 6:

[1] Thus Paul comes, as in the Epistles to the Thessalonians (§ 62, *b*), agreeing with the teaching of Jesus and the early apostles, to declare love to be the highest among the Christian graces. But as he here expressly shows the ground of its superiority, he proves that, according to Rom. xiii. 8–10, love is the fulfilling of the law (§ 87, *d*, footnote 8), in so far as it does no ill to one's neighbour (ver. 10), and therefore the will of God as expressed in the law, which is directed to this end, that no wrong happen to one's neighbour (ver. 9), is fulfilled in this, that one feels bound to mutual love continually, and this duty he believes never to be fully discharged (ver. 8). Just so, according to Gal. v. 13, 14, is love on the positive side the fulfilling of the law, in so far as one is drawn by it to serve another.

μακροθυμία) and gracious, so that it anticipates all with well-doing (Rom. xii. 17; 1 Cor. xiii. 4: χρηστεύεται; comp. Gal. v. 22; 2 Cor. vi. 6: χρηστότης), as the divine love does (Rom. ii. 4). The symbolic expression of brotherly love is the holy kiss (φίλημα ἅγιον: 1 Cor. xvi. 20; 2 Cor. xiii. 12; Rom. xvi. 16; 1 Thess. v. 26; comp. § 47, *a*).

(*c*) Special difficulties to the life of the Church arose partly from differences transmitted from pre-Christian times in the opinion about certain questions, which the one held to be matters of indifference, while the other assigned to them a religious significance. One point of this sort was the partaking of meat sacrificed to idols, in which the one saw defilement as from idol-worship, because they could not get quit of the idea, that the gods of the heathens, which were worshipped by idols, were really deities, even though false and subordinate (1 Cor. viii. 7 comp. with vv. 4–6); while the other ate the flesh without scruple.[2] Just so were there some in the Church who, from ascetic grounds, believed they ought to forego the use of all kinds of flesh and wine (Rom. xiv. 2, 21), and who considered themselves bound to keep sacred certain days (apparently fast days) (ver. 5). Paul designates them as weak in faith (ver. 1), because their confidence in the salvation given in Christ was not strong enough for them to acknowledge that the possession of salvation could not be endangered by such things. He started from the fundamental principle that neither the use nor the denying oneself any food, which, like the organ for which it is appointed, is transitory (1 Cor. vi. 13), can determine the worth of a man before God (viii. 8). He knew that the kingdom of God does not consist in eating and drinking (Rom. xiv. 17), and hence

[2] The decree of the apostolic council had no doubt forbidden the partaking of flesh offered in sacrifice to idols; but this conclusion partly had no validity in the missionary territory of Paul (§ 87, *b*), and partly its original intention was not meant for the regulation of conduct in mixed Christian Churches. When the apostle, starting from the idea that the gods of the heathens were daemons, but not real deities (§ 70, *c*), along with all who had this knowledge (1 Cor. viii. 1, 4, 10), could regard the εἰδωλόθυτον not as flesh consecrated to a deity (1 Cor. x. 19; comp. viii. 4), but only as common food (viii. 8), which, like all food, is the gift of God (x. 26), he therefore did not at all come into conflict with the apostolic decree, as it by no means declared the partaking of flesh sacrificed to idols as sinful in principle, but had only enjoined abstinence for the sake of the synagogue (§ 43, *c*).

he agreed, with those who were confident, to regard everything to eat, and every day, as alike (vv. 2, 5). He is persuaded that in itself no food is unclean (vv. 14, 20), but each is alike good, so soon as it is taken with thanksgiving towards God (1 Cor. x. 30, 31; Rom. xiv. 6); and he hence, in this relation, decisively makes good the fundamental principle that all things are lawful to the Christian (1 Cor. vi. 12, x. 23; comp. iii. 22). But he likewise expressly acknowledges that for those who regarded anything as unclean, it is unclean (Rom. xiv. 14), because he cannot eat it without having his weak conscience (*conscientia consequens;* comp. § 69, *a*) stained with the consciousness of guilt (1 Cor. viii. 7). If he now eat, notwithstanding that his conscience takes offence at the indulgence (Rom. xiv. 20), then this act, not proceeding from the assurance of faith, is sin, by which he falls under the divine condemnation (ver. 23); and any such act condemned by conscience must, while it wounds him in the deepest roots of his religious life (1 Cor. viii. 12; comp. ver. 10), tend directly for him to destruction (viii. 11; Rom. xiv. 15, 20). The existing difference of view cannot accordingly be removed, and Paul only desires that each be thoroughly persuaded (Rom. xiv. 5) in his own mind (*νοῦς*), which, according to § 86, *b*, is the seat of those different ideas, so that he wavers not hither and thither doubtfully (ver. 23), and whatever he decides on keeping, he may employ it in the service of Christ (vv. 6, 7).

(*d*) If, accordingly, the settled differences of opinion in the Church could not assuredly be removed, then, according to note *b*, it was required in this connection to make brotherly love the highest law for one's conduct (Rom. xiv. 15: *κατὰ ἀγάπην περιπατεῖν*), and to ask how one can best care for the peace of the Church and the advancement of others (ver. 19). It is now connected with this in the first place, that the stronger, *i.e.* the more liberal-minded, despise not the weaker regarding his scruples; and, again, that the latter do not condemn the former, as one who, by his freer conduct, has forfeited salvation (vv. 3, 10). Both parties are to receive each other in brotherly love (xv. 7), without the stronger subjecting the scruples of the weaker to his criticism (xiv. 1). But the stronger has thus a special duty of love to discharge;

for to him alone is the matter in dispute a matter of indifference; he alone can give up the indulgence which he holds to be permitted without surrendering in any way his conviction (xiv. 22), and without forfeiting anything thereby in the eye of God (1 Cor. viii. 8). But now love requires that he give no offence to the brother (1 Cor. viii. 9, 13, x. 32; Rom. xiv. 13, 21), *i.e.* does not seduce him to an act contrary to his conscience, which may bring him into condemnation. Were he to mislead him by his freer conduct to similar conduct, without any change on his convictions in their deepest ground, then that is only an apparent advancement of the weak brother (1 Cor. viii. 10), it is in reality his ruin. He will be required, therefore, in certain circumstances, for the sake of another's conscience, to give up an enjoyment in itself lawful (1 Cor. x. 28, 29); in this case the self-denial will be to him morally praiseworthy (Rom. xiv. 21). This has also to do with bearing the infirmities of the weak (Rom. xv. 1; comp. Gal. vi. 2), and not to please oneself, regardlessly maintaining his more free convictions, but to please one's neighbour while he helps him in his Christian life (xv. 2; comp. 1 Cor. x. 33). True love seeks not its own (1 Cor. xiii. 5), but that which is another's (x. 24; comp. Phil. ii. 4).[3]

§ 94. *The Church and the Regulations of the Natural Life.*

The apostle declares the existing higher powers, as such, to be of God, and regards only the going before heathen tribunals as unworthy of Christians (*a*). The Christian, also, in the existing relation of slavery, is to see an ordinance to which he is to submit with real liberty as a servant of Christ, and from which therefore he is not to withdraw himself, even if an opportunity to do so is presented to him (*b*). Although the husband and the wife, in their religious relation to Christ, stand on a footing of perfect equality, yet, in virtue of God's

[3] Paul can, for this, point to his own example, while he became to the Jews a Jew, to the heathen a heathen, to the weak, weak, making himself a servant to all, that he may win all (1 Cor. ix. 19–22; comp. § 87, *b*). While the apostle bases the demand on the liberal-minded directly on this example, it is very clear that his treatment of this question was influenced by the same spirit as was the conclusion of the apostolic council (§ 43, *c*), though this last was also in the first place decided by other relations and for other interests.

appointment grounded on creation, the wife continues subject to the man (*c*). It is an acknowledgment of this position of the woman, that she does not lay aside her head-dress in the public assembly, as that head-dress is the symbol of her submission; and in the Church assemblies she is not to speak (*d*).

(*a*) The Christian community could not lead a life quite apart by itself; it found itself in the midst of a world, from which they knew themselves in their innermost being withdrawn, yet with which they were most intimately connected by the ties of manifold relationships and ordinances of life. According to the fundamental principle, that the Christian should abide in the relations in which his calling found him (1 Cor. vii. 17, 20, 24; comp. § 87, *b*), he was not to rend asunder the ties that bound him to the ordinances of his natural worldly life; he ought rather to regard the fact that the calling came to him in a definite relationship of life, as a requirement of God to fulfil God's commands in the ordinances of that relationship (ver. 19).[1] The first application of this fundamental principle took into view the existing State institution, to which Paul already, according to § 63, *d*, ascribed a high significance. Peter had also put this under the protection of a divine command, which requires subjection to human ordinances. Paul goes a step farther. He declares the existing higher powers, as such (*αἱ οὖσαι, scil. ἐξουσίαι*), to be expressly ordained of God, to resist which, instead of being subject to them, is to incur the judgment of God (Rom. xiii. 1, 2). But it is a divine institution, chiefly in so far as the higher power, as the servant of God, prescribes praise to the good-doer and punishment to the wrong-doer; as to it, even in behalf of this enforcement of right, the sword, and therewith the power of life and death, has been entrusted (vv. 3, 4). But herein also is it the servant of God, that it has the task of collecting custom and taxes, and of laying them out for the common weal, as λειτουργός, *i.e.* as one to whom public duties have been entrusted (vv. 6, 7). On this account also must

[1] Paul thus arrives at the same subjection to all human ordinances as Peter also demands for the sake of God, according to § 47, *b*, and thus he represses *d priori* every attempt to upset in a revolutionary way, in the name of the new Christian principle, the existing ordinances of the natural life, or to mix the specific ends of the life of the Christian community with schemes of social reformation foreign to it, and thereby to compromise those ends.

obedience be given to him for conscience' sake (ver. 5), and dutiful homage (ver. 7). This complete acknowledgment of the existing higher powers does not prevent Paul from declaring it unworthy of Christians to bring their civil disputes before heathen tribunals (1 Cor. vi. 1–8).[2] It cannot appear to be a contradiction to this, that (heathen) powers, as the servants of God, exercise the administration of civil justice; and it is not to be overlooked that in that case the Christian, in virtue of the magisterial institution appointed by God, is subjected to their judgment, while in our case of his own accord he subjects himself to that judgment. Wherever Government acts as God's servant, the Christian has to obey for the sake of God, even when its judgment is not according to right; but when he of his own accord calls it in, he himself ascribes to it a value which it cannot claim for itself.

(*b*) A specially important application of the principle just announced takes place in reference to the relation of slavery. If he, who has been bought with a great price from his former condition of slavery (§ 80, *c*), is not to become a slave of men (1 Cor. vii. 23), the demand might seem to be therein implied, that one should withdraw from any such relationship that is unworthy of a Christian; were the relation of master and slave to cease in the fellowship with Christ (Gal. iii. 28; 1 Cor. xii. 13), then the slave who had become a Christian might believe himself emancipated by the gospel itself. But here the rule applies, that the slave, in the fact of the existing relationship of slavery, is to see God's demand that he fulfil his Christian duties by obedience, according to the rules of that relation. He is therefore to entertain no scruples about remaining as a slave, if as a slave he was converted; but even if an opportunity is given him to become free, he is

[2] It is even bad enough when Christian brethren allow matters to come to the deciding of rights one with another generally, as this implies that the one party has wronged or robbed his brother, and that the other, instead of suffering wrong for the sake of peace, has commenced a lawsuit (vv. 7, 8). But it is unworthy if one carries such a suit before unbelievers, as though no Christian brother were wise enough to decide such a case by arbitration (vv. 5, 6). Christians, however, who are called to judge the world and even angels, thereby judge themselves unworthy to decide rights in these small earthly things (vv. 2, 3), and put those in the chair of judgment whom they otherwise regard as so very much below them (ver. 4), and who by nature are ἄδικοι (ver. 1), and therefore little suited to be judges over them.

himself to prefer to fulfil his Christian calling in the condition in which that calling found him (1 Cor. vii. 21). Even as a slave, if he has become a Christian, he is Christ's freedman, *i.e.* one led by Christ to true freedom; while as a Christian, even if he become free, he remains Christ's slave (ver. 22). The opposition of slavery and freedom in the relationships of the earthly life is, for the Christian, removed by the higher unity of real bondage and freedom; it is for him a thing relatively unimportant, as he has to serve Christ with true freedom in that condition, by fulfilling the duties which the existing rules lay on him. To have in view any removal in principle, or any transformation of the whole relationship through the advancing dominion of Christianity, could not possibly come into the apostle's mind with his expectation of the nearness of the Parousia.

(*c*) In living fellowship with Christ there is removed not only the distinction of pre-Christian religions and of natural social classes, but also the distinction of sexes (Gal. iii. 28); but this removal, it is self-evident, applies only to the religious territory, or to the relation in Christ in which one is equal to another, because each is equally dependent on Christ alone.[3] For the social position of the two sexes to each other, Paul continues to abide by the relation of dependence on the part of the woman, arising from the original law of creation. The woman was created from the man, and this not incidentally, but because she was created for the sake of the man (1 Cor. xi. 8, 9; comp. Gen. ii. 18–22). Hence the man alone was created after the divine image immediately, and wears the likeness of God's lordly authority given him, Gen. i. 26 (ver. 7: *εἰκὼν καὶ δόξα Θεοῦ*); while there appears in the woman but the reflection of this lordly authority (*ἡ γυνὴ δόξα ἀνδρός*), inasmuch as all she is, she is only through the man; all the power she has in the house, she but receives from

[3] To be sure, Paul in a certain sense acknowledges also a natural equality of both sexes, by which each equally requires the other, and neither therefore is simply independent of the other; and he states explicitly that this equality continues in the Christian state also (*ἐν κυρίῳ*: 1 Cor. xi. 14). For the woman was created from the man, and the man, again, is ever born from the woman; both rest therefore upon a divine ordinance (ver. 12: *τὰ πάντα ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ*), by which the man can be without the woman as little as the woman can be without the man (ver. 11).

him, and exercises in his name. It now follows from this that the man is the head (ver. 3: κεφαλή) of the woman, the woman is simply subject to him. If it is said in the context that Christ is the head of the man (§ 92, *a*, footnote 4), naturally it is not meant thereby that He only indirectly, and by the intervention of the man, is the head of the woman, and that her relation to Christ also is different from that of the man; but it is only thereby pointed out, that the man, therefore, has no absolute dominion over the woman, but that he too is simply dependent on Christ, and is bound to exercise his lordship only according to His will.

(*d*) The relation of the two sexes to each other is realized completely only in marriage, and the apostle in these statements has mainly in his eye the married woman and her husband; but he refers to the same thing also in questions which do not relate to marriage at all, or not exclusively, and which we have hence now to look at. The prescribed covering a woman's head with a veil, Paul regards as a symbol of authority (ἐξουσία) which the man has over the woman, according to note *c* (1 Cor. xi. 10). And hence, while the man is not to cover his head, because he would thereby deny the lordly authority given him by God, by assuming the token of subjection (ver. 7), yea, while he would thereby dishonour his head (ver. 4), the woman would, on the other hand, dishonour her head by uncovering (ver. 5). A healthy feeling of decorum declares against this baring of the head (ver. 13: πρέπον ἐστίν), and this on the ground of a natural law, which has given the woman her long hair as a sort of natural covering (vv. 14, 15).[4] If the apostle, in dealing with

[4] For the same reason long hair is regarded as a shame to the man, but an honour to the woman (vv. 14, 15). The cutting of the hair characterized the shameless courtesans (ver. 5). If the woman will lay aside the veil which covers the head, she may also lay aside this natural veil; and the latter, according to all feeling of propriety, is regarded as a shame, and so also is the former (ver. 6: αἰσχρὸν ἐστιν), by putting the wife on a level with the courtesan (ver. 5). It is peculiar to this method of arguing in particular, that the apostle puts the covering of the woman's head in the twofold point of view, a sign of dependence on the man, and also a sign of shamelessness. The desire for freedom is at the same time to him a rejection of natural modesty; only by subjection to the husband is the honour of the wife secured,—the relation of subjection in marriage can be despised only in the interest of shameless harlotry.

this question, speaks of a public appearance of women in the Church assemblies, at which they prayed or uttered prophetic words in public, without expressly condemning it (vv. 5, 13), he did so only for this reason, that with the veiling of the head there required, any such public appearance was even *à priori* excluded. On the other hand, he expressly declares (xiv. 34) that, according to ordinary Christian custom, the woman had to be silent in the Church assembly (ver. 36). To speak in the church contradicts as much the natural feeling of propriety (ver. 35: αἰσχρόν ἐστιν) as it does the subjection of the woman to the man required, Gen. iii. 16 (ver. 34). For he who speaks or prays in public is, at least for the time, the leader of the Church assembly (comp. § 41, *d*), he rules it; and as there are men also in it, the natural subjection of the woman is thus thereby inverted.[5]

§ 95. *Marriage.*

Fleshly intercourse of the sexes, apart from marriage, is not a matter indifferent, but a misuse and a dishonouring of one's own body (*a*). If the apostle regards marriage, in opposition to the prevailing unchastity, as the institution appointed by God for the satisfying of fleshly desire, he thereby by no means excludes any higher honouring of it, as a fellowship of relationship with God concluded in Christ (*b*). Existing marriage is not to be dissolved, and, wherever a separation has occurred, the possibility of a reconciliation is not to be destroyed by a second marriage, and least of all on the part of the Christian in the case of mixed marriages (*c*). Paul for himself, from ascetic grounds, in view of the near approach of the end, prefers to be unmarried; but he regards marriage as not only allowable, but as in the circumstances even enjoined (*d*).

(*a*) It was one of the most difficult tasks in reference to fleshly relationships to make Gentile Churches understand the

[5] Not even under the excuse of asking questions, that they may receive instruction thereon, are they to utter a word in the assembly. If they wish to get instruction, their home is the natural place for that; they may there ask their own husbands (ver. 35), by which the apostle no doubt presupposes that, in case their husbands cannot answer these questions, they may obtain advice in the Church assembly.

right way of looking at *πορνεία, i.e.* the fleshly intercourse of the sexes outside marriage. This, by the Greeks and Romans, was regarded as a matter indifferent. Hence the apostolic council (Acts xv. 20, 29) had already required of the Gentile Christians abstinence from fornication (§ 43, *c*), because it stood for them mainly on the same line with those forms of abstinence which only Jewish customs required. It is clear from 1 Cor. vi. 12, 13, that even at Corinth there was as yet an inclination to excuse the tendency to fornication, so deeply rooted, by ascribing to it a character of indifference. Paul therefore declares with much emphasis that fornication not less than adultery and unnatural fleshly lusts exclude from the kingdom of heaven (ver. 9), and places it thus quite on a level (ver. 10) with other forms of heathenish lusts (§ 62, *a*; 69 *d*). But he wishes here, too, to oppose it not by a simple prescription of the law, but he shows in detail that fornication is no indifferent matter, and is incompatible with the presuppositions of the saving doctrine of Christianity (§ 87, *d*, footnote 9). He shows, namely, that it is different in the matter of fornication from that of partaking of meats which are no doubt indifferent (1 Cor. vi. 13; comp. § 93, *c*). For while in the latter, besides the perishable food only, the *κοιλία* is in question, which perishes in the glorification of the body, in fleshly intercourse (Gen. ii. 24) the whole body is, as it were, surrendered to the harlot, so that the man becomes *ἓν σῶμα* with her (ver. 16); his body is a *μέλος πόρνης* (ver. 15). But now as the body does not perish, as the *κοιλία*, but is restored in glorified form at the resurrection (ver. 17), this latter indulgence has no transitory significance like the former, but an eternal significance; it belongs to the Lord, is destined to become the organ by which the Lord works (ver. 13: *τὸ σῶμα . . . τῷ κυρίῳ, καὶ ὁ κύριος τῷ σώματι*). The body is to become, according to § 92, *a*, a *μέλος Χριστοῦ*, and it is inconsistent with this destiny that it should be made a *μέλος πόρνης* (ver. 15). Fornication is therefore the specific sinning against one's body, because by such stains it is defiled, and rendered unworthy of its high destiny (ver. 18). The same thing is clear from this, that God by the indwelling of His Spirit has consecrated the body to be His temple (ver. 19), and has thereby withdrawn

it from all such profane misuse. It belongs to us, therefore, to glorify in our body Him who has redeemed us, and to whom we therefore belong, by keeping it clear of such defilement (ver. 20).[1]

(*b*) If the God-appointed ordinance of marriage seems to be put on a level with fornication in this, that in both a fleshly intercourse of the sexes takes place, then that given in marriage is distinguished *à priori* in this, that it is put in the point of view of mutual duty,—a duty the husband owes to the wife equally with the wife to the husband (1 Cor. vii. 3). There is therefore a surrender of the power of disposal of one's own body to be at the pleasure of the other (ver. 4); but this takes place by the divine rule, which has made fleshly intercourse to be an essential point in the effecting of marriage (Gen. ii. 24; comp. 1 Cor. vi. 16). If Paul holds the *πρόνοια τῆς σαρκός* to be in itself warranted (Rom. xiii. 14), then the fleshly impulse is in itself in his view warranted, and marriage is the divinely appointed institution for its satisfaction (1 Thess. iv. 4, 5).[2] He looks on the capacity of complete fleshly continence as a special gift of grace, which every one does not possess (1 Cor. vii. 7). Hence Paul desires that, with a reference to the actual incontinence existing at Corinth (ver. 5), and for the avoidance of the sins of unchastity, each one (*scil.* who has not this

[1] There seems then, to be sure, too much, and therefore too little, to be proved; for if the specially objectionable thing in fornication is the giving up of the body, which takes place in fleshly intercourse, to a human being instead of to God and Christ, then marriage, too, seems thereby to be condemned, as the same thing equally happens in it. But it is clear from this that the apostle throughout regards it as self-evident that marriage, according to the passage from Genesis (ii. 24), cited in 1 Cor. vi. 16, is a divinely appointed institution, which requires the giving up of the body to another (vii. 4), and within it; this cannot be inconsistent with the giving of the body to God and Christ (comp. note *b*).

[2] He here looks upon marriage as the means by which the individual obtains in the act his own vessel, *i.e.* his organ for the satisfaction of the fleshly impulse, in which he consecrates the woman for the performance of a divine rule with him, and does him honour (*ἐν ἁγιασμῷ καὶ τιμῇ*), instead of misusing and dishonouring it in lustful passion, as happens in fornication. Hence he desires (1 Cor. vii. 5) that marriage intercourse should be suspended in marriage at most but for a short time, and in consequence of mutual agreement, in a way for ascetic ends, in order that thereby incontinence may not be tempted to unchastity.

gift of continence) shall have his own wife (vv. 2, 9), by which the monogamic character of marriage is already quite strongly expressed. But while he thus in special circumstances maintains this purpose of marriage especially, naturally it does not follow from this that this is the only end, or that its whole nature is merged in fleshly intercourse. There can be given no deeper conception of marriage, than when Paul, as against the scruple which Christian married people might feel to continue the marriage relation with a party yet continuing in unbelief, maintains that the profaneness of the unbelieving party does not stain and injure the holiness of the Christian; but that, on the other hand, the sanctification of the believing party, in virtue of the divinely-appointed living fellowship in marriage, passes over to the non-Christian, and that thus the children of Christian parents, although not yet baptized, are, in virtue of the divinely-appointed family union, sanctified, *i.e.* partakers in the sanctification of the parents (vii. 14; comp. § 84, *d*, footnote 15).[3] If, further, the apostle in the second marriage of widows imposes but one condition, that it takes place *ἐν κυρίῳ* (ver. 39), he thereby, in the most decided way, forbids the forming of mixed marriages on the part of Christians, but he allows marriage to appear expressly as an act done in Christ, *i.e.* an act to be put under the consecration of the religious life.

(*c*) If every one is to remain in the relations in which his calling found him, this also applies to married people. However one also looks at the contracting of marriage: whoever is married, let him not think of separation (1 Cor. vii. 27), neither the husband from the wife, nor the wife from the husband; and for this the apostle refers expressly to a command of the Lord (vv. 10, 11; comp. Mark x. 9). The apostle sets it forth as self-evident, Rom. vii. 2, that death alone dissolves marriage. On this same utterance of the Lord rests undoubtedly the prescription, that if, nevertheless, a separation has taken place, the party put away is to re-

[3] If this conception, on the one hand, presupposes in the clearest way that infant baptism was not practised in the times of the apostle; yet, on the other hand, it is the starting-point from which infant baptism must necessarily arise.

main unmarried (as in the eye of God his former marriage is still valid), or to be reconciled to his spouse (1 Cor. vii. 11). This absolute prohibition of separation has a special significance in the case where only one of the married pair has been converted, and the doubt may well have arisen to the party that has become Christian, whether he must, or only may, continue in the married life with the non-Christian party. Here now, according to the apostolic application of Christ's command, which naturally could not refer directly to such relations, the Christian party is to be prepared unconditionally to continue the marriage relationship so long as the unbelieving party at all consents (vv. 12, 13). If, on the other hand, the non-Christian party separates from the Christian, the latter is not to feel himself bound by that command (ver. 15). Neither can this be said, that he is to continue the marriage, which indeed he could not since the other party has left, nor that he is to marry again, for that would stand in direct contradiction to ver. 11; but he is to harbour no scruples of conscience, that his marriage has now been dissolved contrary to Christ's command (ver. 10). The apostle expressly signifies, he is not to allow the peace to which he has been called (ver. 15) thereby to be taken from him; for even the possibility, taken from him in consequence of the separation, of eventually converting the unbelieving party by the continuance of the marriage relation, was yet a very doubtful one (ver. 16). To the Christian party it only remains to do nothing on his part to change the condition in which his calling found him (ver. 17). It is clear, therefore, that he then speaks of no ground of separation permissible, but only of the relation of the Christian party in the event of separation being forced on him.

(*d*) Paul was himself unmarried (1 Cor. vii. 7, 8; comp. ix. 5), and he for his part regarded complete abstinence from all fleshly intercourse as something praiseworthy (*καλόν*: vii. 1), inasmuch as to him any conduct resulting from victory over natural impulse was something morally worthy (ix. 24–27). He would therefore gladly see all men unmarried, as he was himself, the free remaining unmarried, and widowed persons not marrying again (vii. 7, 8); and this even at bottom is but the consequence of the prescription, that

each one is to remain in the condition in which his calling found him (ver. 27).[4] For this preference of celibacy he asserts, in the first place, a reason of a general kind: marriage leads necessarily to a multitude of earthly interests, and thus begets new cares. And thereby the interests, which ought to be devoted entirely to Christ, are divided between Him and the spouse, while the unmarried enjoy complete freedom to devote themselves body and soul to the interest of Christ and His service alone (vv. 32–34; comp. Matt. xix. 12). To be sure, Paul knew quite well that there is an ἔχειν γυναῖκα ὡς μὴ ἔχοντες, *i.e.* such a having, that the husband continues inwardly free and untrammelled by the married relationship (ver. 29). But if the world's age is being expressly shortened for the Parousia, so that one may learn to keep oneself inwardly clear of all worldly relationships, and thus to prepare for the Parousia (vv. 29–31), one only renders this task more difficult if one burdens oneself with new relationships of that sort.[5] To this is added, that the Parousia is to be preceded by a time of severe trial, and this will be found to be still harder in the encumbered relations of the married state than in the unmarried (ver. 26), so that Paul may truly say, it is only a sparing of them, if, by the advice to remain unmarried, he would spare virgins from the troubles which as

[4] Regard to the propagation of the race could not hinder him from this wish, as he expected the Parousia to be immediately at hand; but yet he gave it as his own idea, very worthy of attention (1 Cor. vii. 25, 40), but which is not to be held as binding on any one (ver. 35). He does not make the mistake that a general compliance with his wish is impossible, as all have not the gift of abstinence, and in this case marriage may be so far a duty (note *b*). But Paul, according to his individuality, cannot judge otherwise than that it is better (ver. 38), and more blessed (ver. 40), not to marry. If it is so, then, *e.g.*, ought a father to give his daughter in marriage?—that depends on whether in her natural constitution there is any objective need for it; if this does not exist, and if the father is persuaded in his own mind of the preference of the unmarried state, then he does good if he does not give her in marriage (vv. 36, 37). But marriage is not only no sin (vv. 28, 36), it is so far a καλὸν ποιεῖν (ver. 38).

[5] It is plainly here, as § 94, *b*, the belief in the near approach of the Parousia which does not allow the apostle in any way to start the question, whether marriage, rightly understood and managed, may not rather help the married in the μεριμνᾶν τὰ τοῦ κυρίου, than hinder. And thus certainly experience proves in a thousand ways the opposite, and thus we acknowledge in a way, as Paul asserts it exclusively, the experience of his own life, in what degree his freedom from family ties made the undivided surrender of himself to the work of Christ possible to him.

wives they will have to pass through at that time (ver. 28; comp. Matt. xxiv. 19). It will be for their good only, if he through such counsels will lessen the trials of the last time, and help them to undivided surrender to the Lord (ver. 35); and herein lies the proof that it is better and happier not to be married (vv. 38, 40). We thus see that the view of the apostle as to the position of Christians towards the laws of the natural life are conditioned by his view of the near approach of the end of the world's development, and this naturally conducts to the representation of his eschatology.

CHAPTER X.

ESCHATOLOGY.

§ 96. *Salvation and Life.*

Comp. R. Stähelin, *Zur paulinischen Eschatologie* (*Jahrb. f. deutsche Theologie*, 1874, 2.

On the grace of God even now experienced in Christ, is grounded the hope which is wrought in the Christian by the Holy Spirit (*a*). Its object is the salvation from eternal destruction, which follows, no doubt, only at the second coming of Christ, but is so certain to the believer by hope that even already he knows he is saved (*b*). As saved he receives eternal life, which, as much on account of the righteousness imputed as the righteousness actually inwrought in him, as much on account of the activity of the Spirit in him as on account of his living fellowship with Christ, must be given to the believer (*c*). Bodily death has thereby lost its significance, inasmuch as it can now but serve to conduct the Christian to a higher heavenly fellowship with his Lord (*d*).

(*a*) In contrast to unbelieving Judaism, which deceives itself with vain hopes (Rom. ii. 3), the Christian, in whom trial works ever anew patience and confirmation (v. 4; comp. § 86, *c*), glories in a hope which does not put to shame, while by its results it is proved to be not void (ver. 5), as it is grounded on the love of God, the felt proofs of which even now give ground to conclude certainly as to those further evidences that are yet looked forward to in hope (vv. 8–11,

viii. 30–32). It is involved, that is to say, in the very nature of hope, that its object is not seen (comp. Col. i. 5), but is to be waited for with patience (Rom. viii. 24, 25) but yet does it fill the heart with joy (xii. 12) and confidence (2 Cor. iii. 12); and, on the other hand, the more that God, who alone can work this hope, fills our hearts with faith, and joy, and peace, the more does hope strengthen in us (Rom. xv. 13), because in this living experience of our saved state we have the pledge that we shall reach its final goal. God gives, therefore, the hope, while He puts us into this saved state (xv. 13: ὁ Θεὸς τῆς ἐλπίδος; comp. 2 Thess. ii. 16); and because this takes place through Christ, our hope rests on Him (ver. 12). As the third principal factor of this subjective Christian life (along with faith and love: 1 Cor. xiii. 13; comp. 1 Thess. i. 3, v. 8; Col. i. 4, 5), hope, like all that pertains to the continuance of that life, can only be produced (Gal. v. 5) and increased (Rom. xv. 13) by the power of the Holy Spirit, who makes us sure of the divine love (v. 5), and is Himself the earnest of those tokens of the love of God yet to be looked for (§ 83, *c*). Accordingly, the central point of the Pauline system does not rest in the doctrine of hope, but in the salvation already received in Christ and appropriated by faith; and the most peculiar thing in the form of the doctrine of hope with Him, is the way in which He connects it with the fundamental facts of His doctrine of salvation, and deduces it from them.

(*b*) The object of Christian hope is, as we found it in the Epistles to the Thessalonians, in harmony with the preaching of the first apostles (§ 61, *b*), the Messianic salvation, since Old Testament passages which refer to this, as Isa. x. 22, Joel ii. 32, are referred directly to Christ (Rom. ix. 27, x. 13). This salvation (σωτηρία) is, according to x. 9, 10, the end of Christian faith and confession, as, according to 1 Cor. i. 21, xv. 2, Rom. i. 16, it is the end of all the efficacy of the gospel (comp. Eph. i. 13). This salvation is here also a salvation from the divine wrath (Rom. v. 9; comp. 1 Thess. i. 10), from death (2 Cor. vii. 10), or from eternal destruction, which, 1 Cor. i. 18, 2 Cor. ii. 15, forms its contrast (comp. Phil. i. 28), therefore from the end which, according to § 66, *d*, comes to all who do not attain to righteousness. It accord-

ingly ensues on the day of Christ's second coming (1 Cor. v. 5; Rom. xiii. 11), when by Him (v. 9; comp. 1 Thess. v. 9) God's judgment decides who are to fall into condemnation and who are to be saved from it. Salvation is therefore simply future; but it is the peculiarity of a living hope, certain of its end, that even now it anticipates this end, that even now that end is ideally present to it. By hope the Christian can even now regard himself as saved (viii. 24: *τῇ ἐλπίδι ἐσώθημεν*). It is, however, implied in particular in this purely negative idea, that when the conditions of this salvation are perfectly fulfilled the man knows himself saved, although that from which he is to be saved comes only in the future, and only along with that the full reality of the salvation itself. In this sense has salvation even now been given to the Gentiles (xi. 11), the day of salvation is even now (2 Cor. vi. 2); for while the gospel offers righteousness (Rom. i. 17), the want of which alone brings condemnation to them, it must be savingly powerful for the salvation of believers (ver. 16). Whoever, therefore, is brought to believe through the preaching of the gospel, is even thereby saved (1 Cor. vii. 16, ix. 22, x. 33; Rom. xi. 14, 26, x. 1). We have here just the same interpenetrating of the present and the future, which we noticed in the teaching of Jesus and Peter (§ 15, *c*; 51, *c*).

(*c*) The positive correlate to the negative idea of *σωτηρία* is the idea of *ζωή*, and this we have already met with in the Epistles to the Thessalonians, in harmony with the preaching of the early apostles as the object of Christian hope (§ 64, *d*). That the gospel is the power of God unto salvation (Rom. i. 16) is grounded (ver. 17) on this, that it reveals a righteousness which brings life (comp. v. 10: *σωθησόμεθα ἐν τῇ ζωῇ*); and, according to 1 Cor. ii. 15, 16, the preaching of the gospel is *ἐν τοῖς σωζομένοις . . . ὀσμὴ εἰς ζωήν*. The fundamental law of the divine righteousness, according to which life falls to righteousness (§ 65, *d*), is therefore not only not abolished in Christianity, but it comes to be directly the basis for this portion of the doctrine of hope. Righteousness, doubtless, is given by grace to men in justification; but after this has taken place, according to that fundamental principle, even life must be assigned to Him who has been declared righteous (Rom. v. 21:

ἡ χάρις βασιλεύει διὰ δικαιοσύνης εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον; comp. vv. 17, 18: δικαίωσις ζωῆς). But righteousness is not only imputed to man, it is also really restored in him; and the end also to which this actual righteousness leads, according to vi. 22, can only be eternal life; but as it is produced only by grace, this eternal life, obtained by means of grace, remains a gracious gift of God, which we have received in Christ (ver. 23).[1] But now actual righteousness is wrought in man by the Spirit, and there is thereby laid a new foundation for the hope of life. For it was the Spirit, on account of whom Christ could not abide in death (§ 78, *d*), whose very nature is such that He is ζωοποιοῦν (1 Cor. xv. 45; 2 Cor. iii. 6), and for this reason He is called (Rom. viii. 2) the Spirit of life. Because, therefore, the object of the Spirit's efforts, even that, therefore, which He wishes by His activity to effect in us, is life (ver. 6), then each one who obeys the rule of the Spirit will live (ver. 13), will from the Spirit inherit eternal life (Gal. vi. 8). If this Spirit has once wrought in us a new life of the Spirit (§ 86, *b*), then this life, on account of the righteousness to be appropriated by it, holds within itself a life raised above (Rom. viii. 10)[2] the death under which

[1] It follows from the express mention of *eternal* life, that that correlation of righteousness and life do not refer to the new moral life, as Schmid (ii. p. 245) and Messner (p. 200) suppose, in which sense it would form a simple tautology. In our Epistles the new moral life is generally mentioned in contrast to being dead with Christ (Rom. vi. 4, viii. 11, 13), and very often, as in Gal. v. 25, as life in the pregnant sense. Besides, ζῆν occurs (Rom. vii. 9) in a metaphorical sense, when the play of thought, that the man lives as long as sin is dead in him, and dies as soon as it revives, determines the representation. Neither in 1 Cor. xv. 22 nor in Rom. v. 10 (Gess, pp. 106, 191) is the new moral life spoken of, not to speak of in the ζωοποιῆσαι, Gal. iii. 21 (Immer, p. 283). Not at all can one attribute a transference of the eschatological idea to the ethical, Rom. viii. 10 (Pfleiderer, p. 206 [E. T. i. 207]; comp. on the other hand, § 84, *c*, footnote 13).

[2] In this passage πνεῦμα can designate only the new spiritual life wrought in us by the Spirit, not the Spirit that is received Himself, as von Hofmann (*in loc.*) will have it; because, as R. Schmidt (p. 36) properly remarks, this latter is life in Himself, and not because of righteousness; but neither does it designate, as R. Schmidt himself will have it, the natural spirit of man, because only those in whom Christ is are spoken of. But then it also follows from this that δικαιοσύνη cannot be understood with him (comp. also Gess, p. 192) of imputed righteousness, but only of righteousness of life; because the latter, but never the former, is drawn from the indwelling of Christ in us (by His Spirit). (Comp. § 84, *d*.)

on account of sin the body falls; and even in this sense one can say that the Spirit is the earnest of the future perfection (note *a*). But through the Spirit we enter upon a living fellowship with Christ, and this secures to us, to be sure, in the first place, only a new moral life (vi. 8); but this life in fellowship with the risen Christ, who can die no more (vv. 9, 10), carries within itself the warrant of an eternal continuance.

(*d*) We have already seen (Rom. viii. 10) that the apostle, while he transports himself to the end of human life, where the result of the development of his life, led by the Spirit (in opposition to the flesh), must come to light, says that the body is dead because of sin, but the Spirit is life, *i.e.* according to its nature it involves life in itself, because of righteousness (note *c*). It is clear from this that for the Christian bodily death has lost its significance. On this account is life, of which the Christian, according to ver. 13, is a partaker, put in opposition to bodily death, as though the latter had for the Christian completely ceased. This death can no longer separate him from the love of God (ver. 38); it can no more put an end to the life in fellowship with Christ, raised as He is above death (vi. 8–10). Bodily death is hence no longer for the Christian death, it is now but a transition state, from which he awakes to a higher life, a state of blessed rest, a sleep (κοιμᾶσθαι: 1 Cor. vii. 39, xi. 30, xv. 6, 18, 20, 51; comp. 1 Thess. iv. 13–15).[3] Apart also from the resurrection

[3] By this biblical mode of expression (comp. Matt. ix. 24) one is by no means, with Usteri, p. 368, to think of the idea of an actual sleep of the soul, as that sleep forms but the contrast to the life of activity in the body (comp. Biedermann, p. 299). On this account also there is by no means to be necessarily connected with it the idea of a troubled shadowy life (Pfleiderer, p. 259 [E. T. i. 263]), so that here again there emerges an irreconcilable contradiction between the supposition of an intermediate state formed from the Jewish (?) hope of the Parousia, and the idea of an immediate blessedness in fellowship with Christ, in which Pfleiderer then sees involved the immanent development of the new (religious moral) life for ever (p. 260 [E. T. i. 264]). The supposition of Sabatier (pp. 153–157), that there came to the apostle, under the fear of death which threatened him between the First and Second Epistles to the Corinthians, the thought of martyrdom, and therewith that of a blessed life with Christ immediately after death, and transformed all his eschatological ideas, is quite unprovable. Even in 2 Cor. v. 2, 4, his longing is to live to the Parousia, in order by the change to be exempted from the laying aside of the body in death.

from death, with bodily death then begins, that is to say, for the Christian a state of blessedness by the fellowship with Christ, which is no longer hindered and troubled by the fleshly life, otherwise the apostle could not long ἐκδημῆσαι ἐκ τοῦ σώματος καὶ ἐνδημῆσαι πρὸς τὸν κύριον (2 Cor. v. 8), and with this longing quiet (comp. Phil. i. 21, 23) the desire to live to the Parousia in order to be exempted from bodily death (ver. 4).[4] That reference should on the whole be made so seldom to the intermediate state between death and the resurrection results from this, that Paul along with that generation hoped to survive till the second coming of Christ (§ 63, *d*), and questions about the intermediate state were taken into account at most but hypothetically. If Paul (1 Cor. xv.) contends with the deniers of the resurrection as though the denial of the resurrection implied a denial of any (at least any blessed) existence after death (vv. 18, 19, 32), it is to be considered that to him, with the denial of a possibility of the resurrection, Christ's resurrection fell (vv. 13, 16),

[4] Paul scarcely thought of the soul of the believer in this fellowship with Christ as in Hades, which, according to Rom. x. 7, is thought to be in the abyss (comp. Phil. ii. 10 : καταχθόνιοι), since the exalted Christ is verily in heaven ; but rather as in Paradise (2 Cor. xii. 4) ; and this is by no means to be sought (as Luke xxiii. 43) in Hades, but beyond the third heavens (ver. 2), therefore in the special dwelling-place of God. This fellowship with Christ is by no means, as Pfleiderer, p. 259 [E. T. i. 263], supposes, the συνδοξασθῆναι, Rom. viii. 17, since a σῶμα τῆς δόξης belongs to the latter. That Paul supposes the clothing with such a body to come immediately after death (which would only furnish a contradiction accepted by him to the doctrine of the resurrection, unless recourse were to be had to the idea of an intermediate body, an idea which he rightly rejects), follows neither from ver. 1, where the existence of a resurrection body in heaven (ἔχομεν . . . ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς) is but the expression for the possession ideally present by hope (comp. Matt. v. 46, vi. 1), nor from ver. 3, where, according to the correct reading and the connection, only the supposition can be expressed, that he will be found clothed and not naked (*i.e.* yet alive) at the Parousia. But even if one were to accept Pfleiderer's interpretation, which is supported by an untenable reading, then the whole interpretation would proceed on the supposition that those who survive till the Parousia will not be unclothed (*i.e.* dead), but clothed upon (comp. § 99, *a*), it cannot therefore admit the idea of a consummation commencing immediately at death, for that would contradict the hope of a Parousia. It may be incomprehensible to modern views how the consummation should not begin immediately after deliverance from the fleshly body (p. 260 [E. T. i. 264]) ; to Paul, however, to whom the consummation of salvation is an act of divine grace, which can be brought about only by the return of Christ, it cannot commence at death.

and that then one could no more speak of a fellowship with the living Christ.[5]

§ 97. *The Resurrection and the Inheritance.*

Comp. Fr. Köstlin, *d. Lehre des Apostel Paulus von der Auferstehung* (*Jahrb. f. d. Theol.* 1877, 2).

The victory over death is completed only by the resurrection, and this must be given to all Christians, both on account of their living fellowship with Christ, and on account of the Spirit of God dwelling in them (*a*). But the resurrection gives them a body of an entirely different kind, which, freed from all corruptibility and weakness, shining with the splendour of heavenly glory, has become entirely the organ of the Spirit (*b*). With this glorified body of the resurrection, Christians receive also a share in the divine glory, and therewith enter on the full inheritance of the children of God (*c*). Finally, they also receive the inheritance promised to Abraham and his seed in the perfected kingdom of God, and in the joint-lordship with Christ (*d*).

(*a*) The final consummation of the Christian cannot consist of purely spiritual fellowship with Christ (§ 96, *d*); for corporeity is an essential condition of complete life, and as its dissolution in death is in consequence of sin, its resumption must be involved in the completion of redemption. In principle the redeemed is delivered from death as the punish-

[5] Then only the troubled shadowy life of Hades would remain, and, from the first, according to the Jewish consciousness, it was no true life and no blessing. On the other hand, a life in fellowship with the exalted Christ could be no more an "unhappy" life, even though there was not the perfect blessedness, and when Pfleiderer, p. 259, footnote [E. T. i. 262], asks what need was there for the resurrection if the soul is already in fellowship with the glorified Christ, he overlooks the fact that Paul, like that whole time, could not conceive a created life in the full sense without a body, and that this (according to footnote 4) purely spiritual fellowship with Christ cannot be the blessed consummation hoped for. If Paul comforts the Thessalonians regarding the fate of their departed brethren, not by referring them to that preliminiminary blessed fellowship, but to their resurrection at the Parousia, that arose from the fact that they, according to 1 Thess. iv. 15, were mainly anxious whether the former would not come at a disadvantage in reference to those who should survive at the Parousia (§ 64, *c*). He can therefore speak only of their fate *at the latter* epoch.

ment of sin, made completely ready to become a partaker of the consummation even without death (2 Cor. v. 4, 5), as even all who shall survive at the Parousia shall not taste of death. But as death is to be vanquished only as the last enemy (1 Cor. xv. 26), all up till then must die, and can be raised only at the Parousia, when, by the removal of death on those who have meanwhile died, the full victory of redemption is obtained (vv. 54, 55). In the hope of a resurrection Paul no doubt agrees with Pharisaic Judaism (comp. Acts xxiii. 6, xxiv. 15, 21), but even this hope finds a firm basis only in Christ. The resurrection from the dead came first by one man, as death came by one (1 Cor. xv. 21); for it is shown by the fact of Christ's resurrection, that there is a resurrection of the dead in general (ver. 12). He is the first-fruits of them that sleep (vv. 20, 23; comp. Col. i. 18; Acts xxvi. 23), who are raised, and their death is only thereby exhibited quite as an intermediate state. The same almighty power with which God has raised Christ will raise us also (1 Cor. vi. 14; comp. 1 Thess. iv. 14; Eph. i. 19, 20). But the ground of this hope lies more precisely, as § 96, *c*, in our living fellowship with Christ. As in living fellowship with Adam all die, so also shall all ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ (*i.e.* naturally all who stand in living fellowship with Him) be made alive, *i.e.* from the connection with ver. 21, be raised (1 Cor. xv. 22); for in order to have complete fellowship with the Risen One, as the prospect is presented to believers in the Epistles to the Thessalonians (§ 64, *d*), they, too, must be raised. Thus only can they share completely in the life of the Risen One, in which they, as ransomed, according to Rom. v. 10, are to be saved (σωθησόμεθα ἐν τῇ ζωῇ αὐτοῦ). On the other hand, regard is here had, as § 96, *c*, to the possession of the Spirit, by whom the living fellowship with Christ is effected. If, that is to say, the Spirit of Him who has raised Jesus from the dead dwell in us, then He who raised Christ from the dead, and who has therefore the power to raise others, will also quicken our mortal bodies by His Spirit which dwelleth in us (viii. 11: διὰ τὸ πνεῦμα); *i.e.* because a σῶμα, which, in spite of its mortality, He has made worthy to be the dwelling-place of His Spirit, cannot for ever fall under the power of death. Thus the dominion of the quickening Spirit, after it has

imparted an imperishable life to the πνεῦμα of believers (viii. 10), must in the end pervade even the body of the man.

(*b*) The resurrection which Paul looked for is by no means what was looked for by the Jews, a simple restoration of the present body. What was indeed hinted at in the teaching of Christ (§ 34, *b*), he has developed still further. He illustrates the details of this by the similitude of the seed-corn, which must perish in order that there may spring from it a vegetable body; and it is an entirely new one (because seed-corn generally had no body, but was a γυμνὸς κόκκος), and yet one peculiar to the particular seed-corn (1 Cor. xv. 36–38). Thus it is the body of the particular individual which has decayed which is quickened at the resurrection; and yet is it, so far as its properties are concerned, an entirely new one, as there are even elsewhere very different σώματα, according to the differences of materials of which they consist, and according to the differences in glory which belong to them (vv. 39–41). The apostle seeks to make manifest by different contrasts the specific quality of the resurrection body. Instead of that corruption which comes into sharpest manifestation by the decay of the body in the grave (φθορά), there comes, according to ver. 42, incorruption (ἀφθαρσία), which in Rom. viii. 23 is designated as the redemption of the body from the δουλεία τῆς φθορᾶς (ver. 21). Instead of dishonour, which belongs essentially to the weak body, and affects in the most striking way the decaying corpse, there comes, according to 1 Cor. xv. 43, δόξα, which is also in Rom. ii. 7 connected with ἀφθαρσία; but it designates not the honour only, but the heavenly light-substance of the resurrection body, worthy of the highest honour (comp. Phil. iii. 21). Instead of weakness, which in the corpse appears as complete powerlessness, comes full power (1 Cor. xv. 43). But all is comprehended in the fundamental contrast (ver. 44), according to which the body sprung from Adam, made of the dust of the ground, was earthly (vv. 47, 48), and therefore physical (vv. 45, 46); while that springing from the heavenly second man (§ 79, *a*) will be heavenly (ver. 48), and therefore, like the body of the risen Christ (ver. 45), spiritual. Therewith likewise are given the incorruption and the fulness of power, but above all that heavenly light-substance which is peculiar to spiritual beings

dwelling in heaven (§ 76, *d*).[1] In this glorified body the spirit has just found an organ completely corresponding to it; it is a building coming from God Himself, as *οἰκία ἀχειροποίητος αἰώνιος* (2 Cor. v. 1). In hope it already ideally exists in heaven (§ 96, *d*, footnote 4), to be given at the resurrection (comp. Col. iii. 4).

(*c*) With this glorified body, formed of heavenly light-substance, the Christian has reached the divine glory (*δόξα*) which, even in Peter and in the Epistles to the Thessalonians (§ 64, *d*), forms the ultimate end of Christian hope (Rom. v. 2: *ἐλπὶς τῆς δόξης*) to which the Christian has been *à priori* appointed (1 Cor. ii. 7; Rom. ix. 23; comp. 2 Cor. iv. 17; Rom. viii. 18, 30; Eph. i. 18). Paul has here, as so often, upon a more general and more indefinite idea of early apostolic preaching (§ 50, *c*, footnote 5), stamped a more definite sense in connection with his system. As, now, Christ at His resurrection first received this divine glory, so are those raised, who bear the image of the *ἐπουράνιος* (1 Cor. xv. 49), made like the image of the Son of God, so that He is the first-born among many brethren (Rom. viii. 29; comp. Phil. iii. 21). As Christ Himself, so they too have entered on the possession of the highest fatherly blessing, and along with that into the full rights of children (viii. 23), so that only now are they perfectly manifested as sons of God (ver. 19; comp. Col. iii. 4), because they share completely in all that the Son of God has (1 Cor. i. 9: *κοινωνία τοῦ υἱοῦ*). But therewith emerges a new ground for this portion of the doctrine of hope. It lies in the nature of the relation of son, especially if that relation

[1] While Gess, p. 113, thinks the body of the risen Christian is to be of the same kind with the body of the Risen One, but as to its substance identical with that laid in the grave, Holsten, p. 132 f., footnote, thinks that the risen body is to be quite a new body, without any real relation to that laid in the grave. Pfleiderer, p. 257 [E. T. i. 260], rightly declares against the latter dilemma. As 1 Cor. xv. 50 unanswerably shows that earthly fleshly materials (*σὰρξ καὶ αἷμα*) can no more belong to the resurrection body, there remains but the only other idea, that the individual organization, which the soul possessed in the earthly, fleshly body, now stamps itself on the substance of the heavenly light-substance, by which, in point of fact, it retains its identity, whether this takes place by the act of changing (§ 99, *a*) or by the quickening (resurrection) of the body that has decayed in the grave. What is treated of here is neither a complete new-creating nor a simple transformation, and this the apostle seeks to prove by the illustration of the seed-corn. Moreover, 2 Cor. v. 1 involves no other supposition, as Pfleiderer, p. 258 [E. T. i. 261], supposes.

is conceived of from the idea of adoption mainly on its judicial side (§ 83, *a*), that it confers a right to the inheritance, *i.e.* to the possession of the father's property (Gal. iv. 7: *εἰ υἱός, καὶ κληρονόμος*). Christians are accordingly heirs of God, and joint heirs with Christ, who, to be sure, has been the first to enter into possession of that inheritance (Rom. viii. 17); and that the apostle is therein thinking chiefly on participation in the divine *δόξα*, is clear from the context (*ἵνα . . . συνδοξασθῶμεν*). As justification is the security for life (§ 96, *c*), so its result, adoption, is the security for participation in the divine *δόξα* as the second chief part of Christian hope, in which the whole blessedness and glory of the future eternal life is comprehended in one great view. But in so far as it is the Spirit who assures us of our sonship, it is clear from this side how He is the seal and earnest of the future consummation.

(*d*) If Paul has sharpened the idea of *κληρονομία*, which with Peter (§ 50, *c*) designates only the inheritance appointed for the Christian, to be the designation of the inheritance appointed for the children of God, there is here shown the same advance in instructive exhibition of early Christian ideas which we have seen above in the idea of *δόξα*. It may even be yet more clearly shown in the transition from the former original signification to the latter, so to speak, dogmatically technical signification. According to § 72, *d*, the possession of the Messianic kingdom was promised to Abraham and his seed (Rom. iv. 13). Abraham was yet the *κληρονόμος* in virtue of the inheritance appointed for him by God (Gal. iii. 18); if, now, his posterity are designated as *κληρονόμοι* (Rom. iv. 14; comp. ver. 16), the thought is here introduced that Abraham's seed, in virtue of their filial relation to Abraham, laid a claim on what belongs to the father, and hence the idea of the heir. If, on the other hand, Christ as Abraham's seed is thought of, He who as the exalted *κύριος* has in the first instance come to be the Ruler and Possessor of the Messianic kingdom, then Christians, in consequence of their living fellowship with Christ, are included in Abraham's seed, and therefore *κατ' ἐπαγγελίαν κληρονόμοι* (Gal. iii. 28, 29; comp. footnote 5, § 84, *b*). But these lines of thought in both turns do not lead to the possession of the divine *δόξα*, but only to the perfected kingdom of God (v. 21; 1 Cor. vi. 9,

10, xv. 50; comp. Eph. v. 5), as Christ and the first apostles had proclaimed (§ 34, 50, *c*; 57, *d*; comp. § 64, *d*). Yes, since Christ rules in this kingdom of God, living fellowship with Him in its consummation may, according to the second turn of the thought, be designated as a ruling with Christ (1 Cor. iv. 8; Rom. v. 17) in this kingdom; and since the function of ruler according to Eastern notions includes that of judging, even this may be ascribed to believers (1 Cor. vi. 2, 3; comp. Matt. xix. 28).

§ 98. *The Second Coming of Christ and the Judgment.*

The realization of Christian hope is connected with the second coming of the Lord in His glory, to which Paul, along with the present generation, even yet hopes to survive; but this second coming of the Lord is preceded by a time of severe trial, and the vanquishing of all ungodly powers (*a*). The day of the Parousia is at the same time the Messianic day of judgment, when God by Christ will decide who is found approved and who is not (*b*). But the rule by which this shall be decided can be only the righteousness required by God (*c*). Even the point of view of an exact retribution in judgment does not contradict the Pauline doctrine of grace, at the same time its specially judicial character is taken from it (*d*).

(*a*) In proportion as the apostle was anxious in his principal Epistles for the exhibition of the salvation that has already appeared in Christ, the announcement of the second coming of Christ comes again, as we have found it so richly pictured in the Epistles to the Thessalonians (§ 64, *a*). Yet here, too, there occurs the idea of a coming of the Lord (1 Cor. iv. 5, xi. 26, xvi. 22; comp. 2 Thess. i. 10; Phil. iv. 5), in which He will be manifested in His glory (1 Cor. i. 7: ἡ ἀποκάλυψις τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ; comp. 2 Thess. i. 7; Col. iii. 4), and with which comes the end in the absolute sense (1 Cor. i. 8; comp. 2 Cor. i. 13, 14), and therewith the moment for the realization of the Christian hope.[1] How near

[1] The term παρουσία, which is often used for the arrival or the presence of a man (1 Cor. xvi. 17; 2 Cor. vii. 6, 7, x. 10; comp. Phil. i. 26, ii. 12), is applied to this only in 1 Cor. xv. 23. If, according to Mark xiii. 20, the last days are

the apostle regarded the Lord's coming is very clear from Rom. xiii. 11, when the short time that had passed since their conversion is already so regarded that the salvation to be brought at the Parousia has during the interval come nearer, so that now the day-dawn of the consummation time is immediately at hand (ver. 12). The apostle even speaks, as he does in the Epistles to the Thessalonians (§ 63, *d*), on the definite supposition that he and the present generation will survive to the Parousia (1 Cor. xv. 22: *οἱ νεκροὶ ἐγερθήσονται . . . καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀλλαγησόμεθα*).[2] There is here no further mention of the eschatological catastrophes which, according to the Epistles to the Thessalonians, he looked for before the coming of the Parousia (§ 63); yet, according to vii. 26, 28, he expects that even yet more severe trials will immediately precede the end. As in this he agrees with the teaching of Jesus and Peter (§ 33, *b*; 51, *b*); so he attaches himself to the early apostolic teaching in this, that he makes the coming of the consummation of all things dependent on the conversion of all Israel hoped for after the completion of the mission to the Gentiles (§ 91, *d*). He expressly says that the compensation for the loss sustained by the temporary casting away of Israel (Rom. xi. 12), namely, the receiving again of the Gentiles as such, will bring about nothing less than the resurrection from the dead (ver. 15), which comes with the consummation of all things. Then every power opposed to God, which up till now has been working in the Gentile world as well as in the unbelieving Jewish world, is stripped of its power, because converted Gentiles and

shortened, in order to save the elect from the ever-increasing risk of falling away, then, according to 1 Cor. vii. 29, the interval to the Parousia is shortened, so that in view of its nearness each one may keep himself free of everything which might impede him in making ready for it (comp. Phil. iv. 5).

[2] If, ver. 51, he appears to assert this of all without exception (read *πάντες μὲν οὐ κοιμηθησόμεθα, πάντες δὲ ἀλλαγησόμεθα*), it has to be considered that, according to the contexts, the only thing he was concerned to bring out here was, that none of those living at the Parousia will pass over into the future kingdom of God without being changed (ver. 50). Individuals of those presently alive would meanwhile fall asleep, and thus these would enter into the category of the *νεκροί*, whom he puts in contrast to the *ἡμεῖς*, ver. 52. That he might himself possibly belong to these exceptions (comp. Phil. i. 20, ii. 17), is so little concealed from him, that, 2 Cor. v. 2–9, he explicitly reflects on what he had to comfort him in such a case (§ 96, *d*).

Jews are rescued from its power, and then comes the end (1 Cor. xv. 24, 25). Paul therefore plainly hopes that the mission, whose work he had advanced in such powerful ways, would progress with equal rapidity, and that its work would be completed even in the current generation.

(*b*) Here, too, as in the Epistles to the Thessalonians (§ 64, *b*), the day of Christ's second coming is the great Messianic day of judgment, presented to view in prophecy (*ἡ ἡμέρα τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*: 1 Cor. i. 8; comp. ver. 7; v. 5: *ἡ ἡμέρα τοῦ κυρίου*; 2 Cor. i. 14; comp. Phil. i. 6, 10, ii. 16).[3] But as Jew and Gentile have been at the Parousia entirely converted (note *a*), this judgment has essentially to do with that sifting of believers, which had been presented to view both by Jesus as well as by Peter (§ 33, *c*; 51, *b*), by which at the end of the development a decision must be given, as to who has been found approved. For, according to § 88, *d*, even election does not prevent believers from falling away, or showing themselves as otherwise unapproved during their earthly development. On account of various sins the Christian may fall under the judgment of God (1 Cor. xi. 29, 31, 32, 34; Rom. xiii. 2, xiv. 23), or into ruin (1 Cor. x. 5–11, comp. viii. 11; Rom. xiv. 15); heathenish sins simply exclude from the kingdom of God (Gal. v. 21; 1 Cor. vi. 9, 10; comp. Eph. v. 5). On those who love not Jesus, Paul utters an anathema (1 Cor. xvi. 22), as on those, also, who teach false doctrine (Gal. i. 9). Christians show themselves unapproved, if Christ is not in them (2 Cor. xiii. 5); they have sunk into death, if they walk not after the Spirit but after the flesh (Rom.

[3] As in the Epistles to the Thessalonians (§ 61, *a*), so here also Christ appears as the Judge of the world (2 Cor. v. 10: *τὸ βῆμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ*), who ought even on that account to be feared (ver. 11; comp. Eph. v. 21), especially throughout those passages where the day of His second coming is regarded as the day of judgment (see above). But often, moreover, as 1 Thess. i. 10, iii. 13, 2 Thess. i. 5, the judgment looked for is the judgment of God (Rom. xiv. 10: *τὸ βῆμα τοῦ Θεοῦ*; comp. ver. 12, ii. 5, 6, iii. 6; 2 Cor. vii. 1). Rom. ii. 16 offers the express means for reconciling these two ways of viewing the matter, when mention is made of the day in which God will judge through Jesus Christ, and 1 Cor. iv. 4, 5, when Christ at His coming passes judgment, and God thereupon awards the recompense. According to the true Old Testament method, this day here too becomes manifest in fire, as the symbol of the judicial wrath of God (1 Cor. iii. 13; comp. 2 Thess. i. 8), only that this fire is regarded as a testing fire, which destroys all which is unapproved, and sets forth on that account all that as approved abides (vv. 13–15).

viii. 13), or if they sorrow over sins committed in the way of the world without changing their mind (2 Cor. vii. 10). He only who suffers with Christ can be glorified with Him (Rom. viii. 17; comp. Phil. iii. 10, 11); and hence only by the patience and the comfort, which the Scriptures work, can hope be preserved (Rom. xv. 4), and therefore the comfort which is effectual in patience has the final salvation in view (2 Cor. i. 6; comp. Phil. i. 19, 28), and the present tribulation, while it works patience, has the future glory in view (2 Cor. iv. 17; comp. Rom. v. 4). The fulfilment, also, of his special calling is for the individual the condition of his participation in the salvation offered in the gospel (1 Cor. ix. 23; comp. Phil. i. 19). And hence all must appear at God's judgment-seat, in order that each may render an account of himself (Rom. xiv. 10, 12; comp. 1 Cor. viii. 8), whether his life has been that of a believer worthy of complete salvation or not.

(*c*) It can only cause surprise that at this judgment the primal rule of the divine righteousness (Rom. ii. 6; comp. § 65, *c*) comes into practice, by which each shall receive what he has done, be it good or evil (2 Cor. v. 10), and that it is not faith, though by it alone, according to § 86, *d*, can a man on his side work out his salvation. On this account Baur, pp. 178, 181, has actually supposed that the whole doctrine of justification, with its contrast of faith and works, must throughout be referred only to the contrast of Judaism and Christianity, as a general contrast regarded in principle in the abstract, which, when applied to the concrete relations of life, immediately becomes again relative; and, on the other hand, Pfleiderer, p. 264 [E. T. i. 267], in the supposition of a day of judgment, sees a remnant of Jewish doctrine inconsistent with the rest of Paulinism (comp. Immer, p. 355). But the gracious institution of Christianity has by no means the object of either abolishing or weakening the essential demand of righteousness (or of the *εὐάρεστον αὐτῷ εἶναι*: 2 Cor. v. 9), but to render its fulfilment possible. If a man has not turned to account the means given him for this, and has not reached the end, he yet continues responsible for this; in the last judgment it can only be asked whether the purpose of God, which He wished to attain by the institution

of salvation, has been attained in the individual or not. In the view of this judgment the Christian is to strive after fulfilling the will of God entirely and on all sides, as every failure in such striving would show that he had mistaken the object of the divine institution of grace, and had not used the means given him for the attainment of righteousness. But this by no means hinders that such defects in his moral completeness, which are not incompatible with perseverance in faith, as they spring but from remaining weakness of the flesh, and so bring about such mistakes and misuse, may be so covered at the judgment just as in justification on the ground of faith.[4]

(*d*) It seems to be specially difficult, if even the judgment on the Christian is presented under the aspect of an exact retribution, as we found it presented in the Epistles to the Thessalonians (§ 64, *b*), in exact correspondence with the method of teaching of the first apostles, and yet this aspect of it is plainly involved in this, that each receive what he has done (2 Cor. v. 10).[5] But this equivalent is not to be regarded in the rigid judicial sense as an external balancing of wages and service, but as the natural correspondence of harvest and seed-time (Gal. vi. 7, 8). Because the whole activity of the Christian was determined by the Spirit, so also every result of this activity must be determined by the same Spirit, on whom depends even the completed salvation hoped

[4] From this point of view the judgment according to works, as Peter also and James (§ 51, *d*; 57, *b*) teach, seems irreconcilable with the premises of the Pauline doctrine of grace, although it must be confessed that the apostle had no need of an explicit reconciling of them. One must concede to Ritschl (ii. p. 363), that Paul nowhere reflects directly on the imperfection of the moral conduct of Christians, which created the need to seek the complement in justification through Christ. But when he correctly refuses (p. 364) the interpretation of 1 Cor. iv. 4 adopted by Meyer, by which Paul will owe his justification in the judgment only to faith, yet with this refusal of any certainty of standing in the judgment resting upon the simple absence of the upbraidings of his own conscience, there is necessarily given him also the possibility that the defects concealed from him, and unfaithfulness in the discharge of his office, will have to be covered by a merciful judgment (comp. Jas. ii. 13).

[5] Future retribution, to be sure (2 Cor. xi. 15 : *ὧν τὸ τέλος ἔσται κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτῶν*), is the natural result of this, that the man, if he has the means to reach the end, and has not used the means (note c), is responsible for that; and if the fundamental principle of an equivalent is employed on this, 1 Cor. iii. 17 (*εἴ τις φθείρει, φθερεῖ τοῦτον ὁ Θεός*), there is offered no ground to suppose, with Ritschl, ii. p. 315, footnote, that this is meant rather apparently than really. Even the

for, according to § 96, *c*; 97, *a*. And if the fundamental principle of the equivalent of wages and service seems to be applied in the stricter sense to the divine blessing, which rewards the gift (2 Cor. ix. 6; comp. Phil. iv. 19 with ver. 18), the image here shows that the wages are not here to be regarded as legally due, but as the result of the same correspondence of seed-time and harvest resulting from a natural necessity, and it is clear from the context that the harvest of this sowing of love consists in the capacity and the desire for a higher service of love (vv. 8–11). The figure of the racer who runs for a perishable crown, forms even a smaller difficulty (1 Cor. ix. 24, 25; comp. Phil. iii. 14). God has set before men the goal of a perfect salvation, and laid down the conditions with which the attainment of it is reached, and the Christian by obedience to these may strive after it, as the racer after the reward of victory, although it is grace which presents it and enables him to attain it (comp. § 32, *a*). But this does not by any means hinder that the acknowledgment of the reward of victory in the latter case, or the harvest in the former, should follow in the final judgment, a matter which Pfleiderer, p. 263 [E. T. i. 266], overlooks. Even every deed, directed to the fulfilment of the conditions for it, may be put into the point of view of one which brings gain or advantage (1 Cor. xiii. 3, xv. 32). The eudaemonism which is apparently implied in this (comp. xv. 19) is not at all objectionable, because the perfect salvation aimed at by such deeds is at once the highest good and the highest realization of the divine will in man (comp. § 32, *c*).[6]

thought of an earthly retribution is so little strange to the apostle, that, just as in the teaching of Jesus, and with James (§ 32, *d*, footnote 4; 57, *c*), disease and early death do occasionally occur as punishments for special sins (1 Cor. xi. 30). But as grace forms the direct contrast to the relation of merit (Rom. iv. 4), and, according to xi. 35 (taken from Job xli. 2), even the original relation to God itself excludes every claim to reward, there seems to be presented here a contradiction, which Reuss (ii. p. 236 [E. T. ii. 214]) thinks he can remove only on the supposition, that Paul for the practical purpose of his exhortation adopted a mode of speech which strictly contradicted his system.

[6] It is somewhat different with those who, as fellow-workers with God (1 Cor. iii. 9), have entered, as it were, into a relation of free contract with Him. In this relation each receives actually his special wages according to his special work (ver. 8), it being assumed that this work will be found approved (vv. 14, 15). In this sense every Christian work in Christ, inasmuch as He, as the

§ 99. *The Final Consummation.*

As the last of all enemies, death is overcome, in that the dead are raised, and those who are alive are changed, at Christ's second coming (*a*). The resurrection and the change prepare a body destined for a heavenly life in the new world, while the unbelieving abide in death (*b*). The end of the final consummation is the future kingdom of God, in which the immediate rule of God will be perfectly realized (*c*). Along with that, the end of the world's development and the supreme glory of God are attained, which the apostle makes it his task to advance by his own example and his invitation to thanksgiving (*d*).

(*a*) The last of all enemies, which, according to § 98, *a*, are conquered *before* the coming of the final consummation, and robbed of all power, is death (1 Cor. xv. 26). If this final consummation, therefore, is to come at the Parousia, then must those Christians who are asleep, over whom death yet rules, although they have been already redeemed in principle from sin and its consequences (§ 97, *a*), be raised at the Parousia (ver. 23), and this resurrection takes place in a moment on the signal given by the last trumpet (ver. 52), which, according to 1 Thess. iv. 16, announces at the same time the second coming of Christ. But even those yet living bear in themselves a body which has not yet been delivered (Rom. viii. 23) from the bondage of φθορά (ver. 21), and is therefore mortal (ver. 11 : τὰ θνητὰ σώματα). This body is not fitted for participation in the perfected kingdom of God (1 Cor.

Risen One, secures to them eternal life, in which the wages are paid, is not in vain (xv. 58). But, according to iv. 5, these wages consist only of the praise which God, according to ver. 2, will distribute to the steward found to be faithful. The apostle's fruitful work thus issues to him in praise on the day of Christ (2 Cor. i. 14), because such fruit shows that God has found his work approved (1 Thess. ii. 19, 20 : στέφανος καυχήσεως ; comp. Phil. ii. 16, iv. 1). Moreover, Paul for his part looks on his preaching of the gospel not as a spontaneous ministry, but as a service lying on him, as a duty, for which he can look for no wages (1 Cor. ix. 16, 17), and he hence seeks his καύχημα, which even here from the context appears evidently as his μισθός, in this, that he renounces his claim on the Church for support, and works gratuitously (vv. 15, 18). But Ritschl, ii. p. 366, rightly mentions, that according to ver. 23 he strives after no other wages than those saving results common to all, results which for him are attached to special conditions (note *b*).

xv. 50); but as death now has no more power, those who survive shall not die, to be immediately raised again, but at the same moment in which the dead are raised, they shall be changed (ver. 52; comp. ver. 51), so that their body immediately for corruption and mortality puts on incorruption and immortality (ver. 53), so that they are immediately clothed upon with the house from heaven, *i.e.* with the glorified body, which is in reserve for the Christian as hope's possession in heaven (2 Cor. v. 1, 2; comp. § 96, *d*, footnote 4). As they in that way are completely delivered from the unclothing of the body, as it takes place in death, while the mortal is immediately swallowed up of life, the apostle earnestly longs to live on till the Parousia (ver. 4). The Epistles to the Thessalonians say nothing of this act of change; but the taking up of the living to eternal fellowship with the glorified Lord promised there (§ 64, *c*) necessarily presupposes it. The bodies of the survivors are thereby for ever delivered from death, and thus complete victory over death is secured (1 Cor. xv. 54, 55).

(*b*) As after the conquering of all enemies, the last of which, according to ver. 26, is death, the kingdom is immediately to be delivered up to the Father (1 Cor. xv. 24), there is thus no room, with Paul at least, for an earthly kingdom of Christ in a Christian sense.[1] Rather, with the resurrection and change on believers, there begins directly the

[1] When Pfleiderer, p. 265 [E. T. i. 268], asserts that, according to the general view of the New Testament, Christ only enters on the *βασιλεία* at the Parousia (comp. on the other hand, Gess, p. 114), our whole foregoing representation shows that this rather took place at His exaltation, by which, therefore, His elevation to full Messianic dignity was realized, to which undeniably the *βασιλεύειν* belongs. As, now, the conversion of Jew and Gentile hoped for, Rom. xi. 25 ff., takes place undoubtedly, according to ver. 15, before the resurrection of the dead, and therefore before the Parousia, and as along with this the greatest possible extension of the dominion of Christ, therefore the conquering of all enemies is the result, then one absolutely does not see what enemies are to be overcome between the Parousia and the end, or who are, according to Gess, p. 116, to be made ready for a blessed quickening. As, now, the judgment is everywhere else connected with the Parousia (§ 98), there is no ground for ascribing to the apostle a chiliastic idea contradictory to all his views (Pfleiderer, p. 266 f. [E. T. i. 268 ff.]; comp. also Immer, p. 355), even if one will, with Biedermann, p. 299, so far spiritualize this idea as to see in it only the successive overcoming of the world by the Spirit of Christ, put in a Jewish form.

perfected kingdom of God, in which, if it is not explicitly designated as the heavenly kingdom, as is the case with Peter (§ 50, *c*), at any rate the contrast between heaven and earth is removed, as it is in the teaching of Jesus (§ 34, *a*, *b*).[2] Then is the perfect (*τὸ τέλειον*) come (1 Cor. xiii. 10), when the gifts (ver. 8), and all the knowledge that is in part (ver. 9), come to an end. The seeing face to face then begins in immediate fellowship with God (ver. 12; comp. § 34, *b*). It is connected with this, that Paul knew nothing of a twofold resurrection. If he says, 1 Cor. xv. 23, that each of those who are quickened with Christ will be quickened in the company to which he belongs, and this is then explained that the *οἱ τοῦ Χριστοῦ* rise in common at His Parousia, then the question is only thereby obviated, Wherefore, then, do none of those that sleep rise as Christ? The first-fruit has already risen, and according to the foregoing representation our resurrection is entirely connected with His.[3] Paul speaks

[2] This is inevitably clear from this, that just *because* flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God, the change on the living comes simultaneous with the resurrection, according to 1 Cor. xv. 50 ff.; that, according to vv. 48, 49 (comp. 2 Cor. v. 1, 2), those raised receive a heavenly body; and that the whole (irrational) creation waits for the time of the complete manifestation of the sons of God (comp. § 97, *c*), introduced therewith, as their deliverance from the *δουλεία τῆς φθορᾶς* comes along with it (Rom. viii. 19). For this *δουλεία τῆς φθορᾶς* is apparently in consequence of the curse which God after the fall uttered on the earth (Gen. iii. 17, 18), subjecting it to vanity and transitoriness, and that unwillingly, to be sure, without its co-operation or its own fault, but only on account of God, who subjected it to transitoriness in consequence of Adam's sin (ver. 20). But on that account, also, is the hope permitted it, that it shall be delivered from this bondage of transitoriness, and attain to the glory of the freedom corresponding to the children of God (ver. 21), after which even now it altogether sighs, and which it strives, as it were, to bring forth in the painful throes which shoot through it (ver. 22). Then a new glorious world appears in place of the present, which, according to 1 Cor. vii. 31, is already passing away. Indeed, in the Epistles to the Thessalonians we saw the believers were taken from the earth, and taken home by the exalted Lord to heavenly fellowship with Him (comp. § 64, *d*).

[3] R. Schmidt, p. 137, also acknowledges this tendency; but then there is certainly no difficulty, by the fact that by the *ἕκαστος ἐν τῷ ἰδίῳ τάγματι* the *πάντες* of ver. 22 are separated from Christ, in whom they rise, and there is no need of a violent separation of this sentence from what follows (p. 135), which ever leads back again to the unproveable idea, irreconcilable with note *a*, of a resurrection in different parts (*τάγματα*). If Paul adds that on the resurrection of Christians the end follows (ver. 24: *εἶτα τὸ τέλος*), it is arbitrary to understand this otherwise than 1 Cor. i. 1, 8, 2 Cor. i. 13, where it designates the final consummation (comp. § 98, *a*) that comes with the Parousia; and the *εἶτα* is by no means

here, as in the Epistles to the Thessalonians (§ 64, *c*), always, according to § 97, only of *one* resurrection, which is conditioned by living fellowship with Christ and the possession of the Spirit (comp. Phil. iii. 11), and only of *one* kind of a resurrection body (comp. Phil. iii. 21), which belongs to the inheritance of the children of God. To those who have no part in the Christian salvation, there is therefore no resurrection (comp. § 34, *d*).[4]

(*c*) As, indeed, in the Epistles to the Thessalonians, after the example of Christ and the first apostles (§ 64, *d*), the state of the heavenly final consummation, in which believers are made capable of participating by the resurrection and glorification (note *b*), is simply designated the kingdom of God (1 Cor. xv. 50). From this kingdom all sinners are shut out (vi. 9, 10; Gal. v. 21; comp. Eph. v. 5).[5] In it is the

equivalent to πότε, which Gess, p. 116, objects to, if the result designated thereby is immediate. To think of the end of the resurrection, and so on the resurrection of those who are not Christians, is therefore quite impossible, as Paul knew of no intermediate chiliastic kingdom (comp. footnotes 1, 2), and because the πάντες in xv. 22, to which the ἕκαστος in ver. 23 refers, are those only who have been quickened in Christ, and are therefore believing Christians, and so neither Christ nor unbelievers can be included in ἕκαστος. This in opposition, too, to Pfleiderer, p. 264 f. [E. T. i. 268]. According to 1 Cor. xv. 24–26, the delivering up of the kingdom to the Father follows immediately after the conquering of all enemies, the last of whom is death. This conquering is perfected by the resurrection of the dead and the changing of believers (vv. 54, 55); there cannot therefore be a fresh conquering of death to follow, by the resurrection of unbelievers in the other world after an intermediate period, as is ever thought.

[4] While on the day of the resurrection the whole creation shall be delivered from the bondage of φθορά, under which it has fallen (Gal. vi. 8; comp. 1 Cor. iii. 17). Their end is destruction, and this, according to § 66, *d*, consists in death, which forms the contrast to eternal life (Rom. vi. 21, 23; comp. 2 Cor. ii. 15, 16; Rom. viii. 13), and it will therefore never be removed. But the resurrection can have only one purpose, to remove this condition of death, and Paul can have looked upon it only as an abiding shadowy life in Hades (§ 34, *c*), and that to him was also an unblessed life. The καταργεῖσθαι of death, as the last enemy (1 Cor. xv. 26), does not stand in contradiction with the continuance of unbelievers in death. If death now only rules even over those who, by the final judicial sentence of God, have fallen under the power of death, their death is no longer a power resisting God; it is, as all others, subject to the will of God, and must serve Him (vv. 27, 28). Only in this sense is it said, even in ver. 24, of all other God-opposing powers, that they are brought to nought, *i.e.* are robbed of all their independent power and efficacy (comp. § 98, *a*), which is immediately explained in their being put under the feet of Christ, made to serve His will (ver. 25).

[5] Paul uses the expression ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ only of the kingdom of the consummation, never of the earthly fellowship of believers. In passages like Rom. xiv. 17, 1 Cor. iv. 20 (comp. Col. iv. 11), where it might not so appear, it is not

dominion of God perfectly realized. Christ, who as Redeemer has hitherto wielded dominion over believers (§ 76, *c*), and to whom in the end all His enemies shall be subdued, according to § 98 (1 Cor. xv. 24–28), gives up the dominion to God (ver. 24); because now the object of the mediatorial rule, which is to restore the dominion of God on the earth, which has been destroyed by sin, has been fulfilled. Henceforward God is all in all (ver. 28), *i.e.* in contrast to the mediatorial rule held by the Son. He has become the immediate ruler in all. Even the context of this passage excludes any referring of it to a restitution of all things (*Apokatastasis*), for the dominion which God henceforward wields immediately can be no other than that which Christ has received and given up to Him; and that does not consist in this, that all hostile powers are destroyed or converted, but in this, that they have become powerless, and are subject to His will.[6] It is clear, at any rate, from § 91, *d*, in what a comprehensive way Paul hopes for the conversion of Jews and Gentiles as a whole, and that he even regarded the apostasy of those once converted, a thing in itself possible, as occurring only in rare exceptions over against the protecting faithfulness of God.

said of the kingdom of God in its actual realization, but of the kingdom of God in its nature, which must naturally furnish to the believer the rule of his behaviour. As to the question why, with Paul, and in the New Testament Epistles generally, the idea of the kingdom of God as it presently is being realized (§ 14) falls into the background, see Ritschl, ii. pp. 293–299.

[6] Even Neander held it to be likely that in this passage there lay the idea of a restitution of all things (*Apokatastasis*); and latterly Pfleiderer, p. 271 [E. T. ii. 276], has again asserted it very emphatically (comp. also Immer, p. 356). To be sure, one will certainly not take ἐν πᾶσιν as a neuter, with Gess, p. 118 f., and venture to hint that Paul speaks only of the efficacy of the resurrection. But as ver. 22, on which Pfleiderer relies, means only with Paul, as is self-evident, that only believers who are in Christ can be quickened in Christ; so here, that in the perfected kingdom of God, when God is all in all, they only have come to the consummation of salvation. In the powers, which have been only unwillingly subdued, God is certainly not τὰ πάντα; but in this context these come into notice only in so far as they can no longer hinder the perfect dominion of God from being realized in the kingdom of God, in which they *à priori* have no share. Pfleiderer himself shows that Paul assumes a twofold issue throughout for the final destiny of men, and would not dispute that the doctrine of election in particular presupposes this, were he not misled by a misunderstanding of Rom. xi. 32 (comp. § 88, *a*; 91, *d*, footnote 6). There remains, then, nothing else than to assume a suspense on the part of Paul between two inconsistent ideas (Biedermann, p. 300), and with that again an unsolved autonomy (Pfleiderer), for which we have nowhere found occasion with Paul.

(*d*) The ultimate end of the entire development of God is the glory of God; for as all is from Him and by Him, so is He the end for which all is intended (Rom. xi. 36: *τὰ πάντα ἐξ αὐτοῦ καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰς αὐτόν*), and this applies specially to the world of redeemed men (1 Cor. viii. 6: *ἐξ οὗ τὰ πάντα καὶ ἡμεῖς εἰς αὐτόν*). Hence to Him is due the honour for ever (Gal. i. 5; Rom. xi. 36, xvi. 27; comp. Eph. iii. 21; Phil. iv. 20), which the apostle presents to Him in his doxologies (2 Cor. xi. 31, i. 3; Rom. i. 25; comp. Eph. i. 3). This ultimate end is to be kept steadily in view in the earthly realization of the divine purpose of salvation. If the Church is bound together in unanimity according to the will of Christ (Rom. xv. 5), she strives after this ultimate end, that all with one heart and one mouth should praise God (ver. 6). To advance this praise of God, Christ has cared for us (ver. 7), and in particular for the Gentiles (ver. 9). The fulfilment of all the promises of God in Christ have Him in view (2 Cor. i. 20; comp. Eph. i. 6, 12, 14, iii. 21; Phil. i. 11, ii. 11). The whole conduct of Christians is thus to conduce to the glory of God (1 Cor. vi. 20, x. 31: *πάντα εἰς δόξαν Θεοῦ ποιεῖτε*; comp. Gal. i. 24; 2 Cor. ix. 13). But this takes place in particular by the continual thanksgiving (*εὐχαριστία*) for all the present gracious acts of God (2 Cor. iv. 15). And hence the apostle's mouth overflows with thanksgiving for what God's grace has done for the Church (1 Cor. i. 4; 2 Cor. viii. 16, ix. 15; Rom. i. 8, vi. 17; comp. 1 Thess. i. 2, ii. 13; 2 Thess. i. 3, ii. 13; Col. i. 3; Eph. i. 16; Philem. 4; Phil. i. 3) and for himself (1 Cor. i. 14, xiv. 18, xv. 57; 2 Cor. ii. 14; Rom. vii. 25). And hence he never ceases to exhort them to similar thanksgiving (2 Cor. i. 11, iv. 15, ix. 11, 12; comp. 1 Thess. v. 18; Phil. iv. 6; Col. i. 12, ii. 7, iii. 17, iv. 2; Eph. v. 4, 20).

SECTION III.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF PAULINISM IN THE EPISTLES OF THE IMPRISONMENT.

CHAPTER XI.

THE PAULINE FIRST PRINCIPLES.

§ 100. *The Doctrine of Justification.*

Although discussion on the presuppositions of the doctrine of justification falls into abeyance in the Epistles of the imprisonment, yet these Epistles proceed on the same fundamental principles, and, in particular, on the same anthropological ideas, as the earlier Epistles (*a*), and on the same religious-historical view of heathenism and Judaism (*b*). Here also begins the time of grace, mediated by Christ, a time whose institution of salvation rests on the death of Christ (*c*). Finally, the thesis of justification appears, quite by the way, in all its sharpness, and with it the doctrine of the new filial relationship to God (*d*).

(*a*) Along with the polemic against Judaism (comp. § 59, *c*), the more thorough discussion and grounding of the presuppositions, on which the doctrine of justification rests, must necessarily fall into abeyance in the Epistles of the imprisonment. Yet they do not disappear. Even the idea of righteousness (comp. § 65) is conceived of as in the earlier Epistles,[1] and its relation to *ἀλήθεια* is quite Pauline. *Δικαιοσύνη*, as the normal condition of man created after God, corresponds to truth as moral principle (Eph. iv. 24:

[1] What is termed (Col. iii. 20) simply *εὐάρεστον*, what is acceptable to God (Rom. xii. 1, 2; comp. xiv. 18; 2 Cor. v. 9; Eph. v. 10; Phil. iv. 18), is called in the parallel passage (Eph. vi. 1) *δίκαιον*. A relaxing of the stronger doctrinal statements is shown only in this, that Col. iv. 1, Phil. i. 7, corresponding rather to the classical use of the word, *δίκαιον* denotes that which corresponds to the relation of man to man. If, on the other hand, *ἀδικεῖν* (Col. iii. 35; Philem. 18) is used of unrighteous dealing towards others in the stricter sense, that is the case also in the earlier Epistles, according to § 65, *b*, footnote 2.

δικαιοσύνη . . . τῆς ἀληθείας), the right is also the true (Phil. iv. 8), righteousness and truth are synonymous ideas (Eph. v. 9, vi. 14).[2] The righteousness of God appears as impartiality (Eph. vi. 9; Col. iii. 25); it is His anger which comes on the children of disobedience (Eph. v. 6, ii. 2, 3; Col. iii. 6), and brings destruction on them (Phil. iii. 19; comp. i. 28). There is no doubt here also a way man may procure righteousness for himself, by obeying the law (Phil. iii. 9: ἡ ἐμὴ δικαιοσύνη ἡ ἐκ τοῦ νόμου; comp. § 66, *a*); but here righteousness is never actually attained in this way.[3] Heathens and Jews walk in lusts which deceive men; while they promise them deliverance and therewith blessedness (Eph. iv. 22), they allow them instead to sink into passion (πάθος: Col. iii. 5) and the wrath of God (Eph. ii. 2, 3). It is this empirical state also that the term ὁ κόσμος characterizes; it rarely designates the universe (Eph. i. 4), but ordinarily the world of men (Col. i. 6), and the unchristian world to be sure (ii. 8, 20), the ungodly (Eph. ii. 12), which is ruled by sin (Phil. ii. 15 = γενεὰ σκολιὰ καὶ διεστραμμένη), as it applies to the pre-Messianic age (Eph. ii. 2: ὁ αἰὼν τοῦ κόσμου τούτου), in contrast to the Messianic (i. 21: ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι τούτῳ καὶ ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι). Above all, the anthropological principles, on which the assertion of the general sinfulness rests, are in our Epistles specifically Pauline (comp.

[2] Besides, ἀλήθεια denotes, as § 65, *b*, footnote 3, the truth of a statement (Eph. iv. 25), or the sincerity of an effort (Phil. i. 18), the truth, as the contents of the Gospel (Col. i. 5; Eph. i. 13), or that the being instructed in Christ is real (ἀλήθεια = τὸ ἀληθινόν: Eph. iv. 21), the knowledge of the readers is a knowledge in truth (Col. i. 6). Along with the opposition to the doctrines of the law, on the other hand, there disappears here the designation of sins (ἁμαρτίαι: Eph. ii. 1; Col. i. 14; παραπτώματα: Eph. i. 7, ii. 1, 5; Col. ii. 13; ἔργα πονηρά: Col. i. 21; comp. Eph. v. 16) as παραβάσεις, and their principle as ἀνομία. On the other hand, the essence of righteousness is very frequently designated as a doing of the will of God (Eph. vi. 6; comp. v. 17; Col. i. 9, iv. 12), or of what is well-pleasing to God (Col. iii. 20; comp. Eph. v. 10), as good works (Col. i. 10; Eph. ii. 10), or as goodness generally (ἀγαθωσύνη: Eph. v. 9; comp. 2 Thess. i. 11; Gal. v. 22; Rom. xv. 14).

[3] When the apostle says (Phil. iii. 6) that he is as to the δικαιοσύνη ἡ ἐν τῷ νόμῳ blameless, it is clear from the connection that the question is discussed only on the ideal of the Pharisees, an ideal which he had no doubt fully realized that this blamelessness is not meant according to the standpoint of God, but from that of his party. It may, however, be conceded that in the conflict with Judaistic teaching about the law, he would not have made use of any such expression, on account of possible misapplication.

§ 68). Here also the ideas of *σάρξ*, *ψυχή*, *καρδία*, common to the whole New Testament, form the presupposition, as has been shown already, § 67, *d* (comp. especially footnotes 6 and 7), and § 68, *d*, footnote 12; but the peculiar change is now introduced by which the natural *σάρξ* is human nature untouched by grace in general (comp. Phil. i. 22, iii. 3, and therewith § 68, *b*, footnote 5), and in this sense it is the seat of sin (Eph. ii. 3: *ἐπιθυμίαι τῆς σαρκός*).[4] Connected with this it is that the *ψυχή*, or the natural human *πνεῦμα* (at Col. ii. 5; comp. § 68, *c*, footnote 9), no longer appears as the bearer of the higher life in man; that is rather said, Eph. iii. 16, quite as § 68, *d*, of the *ἔσω ἄνθρωπος*, which requires to be strengthened by the Spirit in the natural man; it is therefore weak because it wants this Spirit, and ver. 17 shows that the *ἔσω ἄνθρωπος* has its seat in the heart, as has the *νοῦς*, identical with it, along with its *νοήματα*.[5]

(*b*) The religious-historical consideration of heathenism in

[4] This is shown very clearly (Col. ii. 11) where the *σῶμα τῆς ἁμαρτίας* (Rom. vi. 6) is called the *σῶμα τῆς σαρκός* (Eph. ii. 3; Col. ii. 18), where mention is made of the *θελήματα* and a *νοῦς τῆς σαρκός*, and ii. 23, where severity to the body works a satisfying of the flesh, the two therefore forming a relative contrast. It is, moreover, specially noteworthy how human masters are here called *κύριοι κατὰ σάρκα*, in contrast to the higher Master believers in Christ have (Eph. vi. 5; Col. iii. 22; comp. Philem. 16), where the lordship can be regarded as within the sphere of this present visible world quite as little as in the similar expressions in the earlier Epistles (comp. R. Schmidt, p. 23, and therewith § 68, *a*, footnote 3).

[5] There is only an apparent contradiction to the Pauline opposition of the *νοῦς* and *σάρξ* when the Christian, who surrenders himself to self-devised human wisdom, becomes, according to Col. ii. 18, puffed up by his fleshly *νοῦς*. It is rather as clear as possible how the *σάρξ* is the natural human nature in opposition to the divine, to which belong even spiritual sins such as pride. As the *σάρξ* remains in the Christian, and even contends with the *πνεῦμα*, it may naturally the more easily master the *νοῦς*, which has been made capable of resistance only through the spirit; and it is a sign that the *πνεῦμα* has again fallen under the power of the *σάρξ* (comp. the *σῶμα τ. σαρκός*: Col. ii. 11), if the Christian becomes puffed up by it in sinful pride. Just so is the expression *πνεῦμα τοῦ νοὸς ὑμῶν* (Eph. iv. 23) simply explained thereby, as even Pfleiderer, p. 456 [E. T. ii. 188], cannot well question that the *νοῦς* of the natural man furnishes the point of connection for the divine *πνεῦμα*, by which the inner man or the *νοῦς* is strengthened (iii. 16) and renewed (comp. Rom. xii. 2), after it has been weakened by sin and emptied of its true contents (iv. 17). Here also the *νοῦς* remains in the Christian the seat of the rational reflective consciousness (comp. § 86, *b*), which cannot comprehend how one may be calm and joyful in the face of all fates (comp. Eph. iii. 20), and is thus the source of the care which is to be conquered by the peace of God (Phil. iv. 7; comp. ver. 6).

our Epistles furnishes the most interesting parallels to the representation of the earlier Epistles (comp. § 69, 70). The heathen, or the Greeks (Col. iii. 11), walk in the *ματαιότης* of their *νοῦς* (Eph. iv. 17), because they have emptied it of its true contents by their departure from God (comp. Rom. i. 21), and their hearts have become thereby even harder, *i.e.* they have become unreceptive of the knowledge of the divine, and thus they have become the victims of an ignorance which is the result of their own guilt (ver. 18: *διὰ τὴν ἄγνοιαν τὴν οὖσαν ἐν αὐτοῖς διὰ τὴν πώρωσιν τ. καρδίας αὐτῶν*, a point which Pfleiderer, p. 435 [E. T. ii. 166], overlooks; comp. Acts xvii. 30), by which they are darkened in their whole mental activity (ver. 18: *ἐσκοτωμένοι τῇ διανοίᾳ*; comp. v. 8: *ἦτε . . . πότε σκότος*). From a practical point of view, the consequence of that departure from God was in principle disobedience (ii. 2, v. 6: *υἱοὶ τῆς ἀπειθείας*), which is alienated from Him and at enmity in mind (Col. i. 21); it was also the specific heathenish lusts of covetousness and uncleanness, which are here designated as *εἰδωλολατρεία, i.e.* as an idolizing of earthly lust and earthly treasure (Col. iii. 5; Eph. v. 5), and as a secret horror, about which decency forbids one to speak (ver. 12). Here also idolatry, on the one hand, is a worshipping of beings which are not gods (*ἄθεοι*: ii. 12); on the other hand, a bondage under the powers of darkness (Col. i. 13; Acts xxvi. 18), which as the rulers of the world govern the children of disobedience (ii. 2). The result of the moral development in heathenism, which appears here incidentally as a judgment of God (v. 6), is complete loss of feeling towards every upbraiding of conscience (iv. 19: *ἀπηλγηκότες*), in which they give themselves up without check or shame to unchastity (*ἀσέλγεια*). On the other hand, heathenism is here regarded as a rudimentary religion, as the Gentile Christians of Colosse, according to Col. ii. 20, by their being dead with Christ, have been emancipated from the *στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου*. From it Judaism (the circumcision, in contradistinction to the uncircumcision: Eph. ii. 11; Col. iii. 11, iv. 11) is separated by means of the law, which hems in all their forms of life by its definite restrictions like a hedge (Eph. ii. 14, 15). Yet the Jews really walk in the lusts of the flesh like the children of disobedience, and are on that

account, like them, children of wrath (ver. 3; comp. § 71, *d*). But if *φύσει* is here added, that already involves the opposite of what they have become *θέσει*, *i.e.* on the ground of the covenant of promise (ver. 12). Here also, that is to say, as § 72, *d*, are circumcision and descent from the fathers (Phil. iii. 5) designated as a higher gain (ver. 7), so far as they condition a share in the promise, on the ground of which the Jews already hoped for the Messiah (Eph. i. 12), while the Gentiles lived without hope (ii. 12). As regards the use made of Scripture in the Epistle to the Ephesians, comp. § 73, 74.

(*c*) The divine purpose of salvation is here also, as § 75, *a*, designated as *τὸ μυστήριον τὸ ἀποκεκρυμμένον ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων* (Col. i. 26; Eph. iii. 9; comp. vv. 3, 4). It was, to be sure, predicted in prophecy, but, because it was appointed for the Christian present, and can be perfectly understood only in the light of its fulfilment, it was not so made known to the other generations of men as it has now been revealed to the apostles and prophets (ver. 5), wherein there is therefore implied no sort of depreciation of Old Testament prophecy (Pfleiderer, p. 436 [E. T. ii. 167]),—that is to say, God has now made known the secret of His will in conformity with the plan, formed with Himself in reference to the dispensation (*οἰκονομία*) of the *πλήρωμα τῶν καιρῶν*, *i.e.* a fixed period in which the measure of the ages that are past was to become complete, and so the time for the performance of His purpose was to be ripe (i. 9, 10; comp. Gal. iv. 4). The principle of this performance is here also that divine grace, which forms the contents of the gospel (Acts xx. 34: *τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς χάριτος τοῦ Θεοῦ*; comp. ver. 32), which was on that account heard and acknowledged (Col. i. 6), whose working is a gift of God, and which forms the contrast to all human works (Eph. ii. 8, 9).[6] According to iv. 7, it is Christ who, by the

[6] By it are we delivered (Eph. ii. 5) and redeemed (i. 7); from it has proceeded, according to i. 3–6, the eternal election, and in the introduction of all the Epistles (Col. i. 2; Philem. 3; Eph. i. 2; Phil. i. 2) it is asked for the readers. Here also the mercy of God (comp. Phil. ii. 27), compassionate to the need of men lying in the death of sin, and love as the frame of mind for the sake of which such mercy works in Him, are distinguished from grace by which this mercy works (Eph. ii. 4; comp. i. 1-4); so also the beneficent goodness by which grace is evidenced is distinguished from grace itself (ii. 7). Here also

distribution of His gifts, brings about the possession of grace, and therefore in the opening salutations (with the exception of Col. i. 2) He appears along with God as the original possessor of grace; and Phil. iv. 23, Philem. 25, as in the earlier Epistles, the accompaniment of His grace is asked for the readers.[7] According to Col. ii. 6, this Jesus Christ is preached to the Christians as Lord (comp. § 76, *a*), and they acknowledge Him as such (Phil. ii. 11; comp. Eph. v. 20; Col. iii. 17); the solemn designation of the Redeemer is *ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστός* (Eph. i. 3, 17, v. 20, vi. 24; Col. i. 3; Philem. 25. Comp. Phil. iii. 8: *ὁ Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς ὁ κύριός μου*).[8] But the Mediator of divine grace is here also (comp. § 80) Christ by His death (Col. i. 22), which is here on purpose qualified as a death on the cross (Col. i. 20, ii. 14; Eph. ii. 16; Phil. ii. 8), and here it is conceived sometimes

ἡ χάρις ἡ δοθεισά (iii. 2, 8; comp. Phil. i. 7) designates an individual activity of grace, a specific evidence of mercy (comp. Eph. iv. 29 for an evidence of human love), only that *χάρις* on that account is used without more ado in the sense of *χάρισμα*, which latter (iii. 7) is expressly described by *δωρεὰ τῆς χάριτος*.

[7] By Him is everything mediated for which the Christian has to thank God (Col. iii. 17)—atonement (i. 20), sonship (Eph. i. 5), access to God (ii. 18), the fruits of righteousness (Phil. i. 11); in Him it is that God has admitted us to share in His grace (Eph. i. 6, ii. 7); in Him have we redemption (i. 7), the forgiveness of sins (iv. 32), reconciliation with God (ii. 16); in Him we receive every blessing (i. 3; comp. Phil. iv. 19), from eternal election onwards (Eph. i. 4, iii. 11); and hence all praise to God is grounded in Him (iii. 21).

[8] It is very noteworthy that the different designations of Christ in our Epistles show very exactly the same appearances as in the earlier Epistles. The name *Ἰησοῦς* occurs only in Eph. iv. 21; Phil. ii. 10; most commonly it is *Χριστός* (about thirty-two times) and *ὁ Χριστός* (about thirty-seven times). In the order of the names the codices vary very much (Eph. ii. 20; Phil. i. 6; Philem. 1, 9) between *Ἰησοῦς Χριστός*, which, however, occurs here without any addition very rarely (Eph. i. 5; Phil. i. 11, 19, ii. 11), and *Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς*, which occurs without different readings only in connection with the standing formula, about eleven times, *ἐν Χριστῷ* (or *ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ*: about nineteen times; comp. Eph. iii. 11: *ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ τῷ κυρίῳ ἡμῶν*); but here, too, the reading is pretty certain, Col. i. 1, ii. 6, iv. 12; Eph. i. 1, iii. 1; Phil. i. 8. Christ is usually called *ὁ κύριος* simply (about ten times), or *κύριος* (five times), especially in the formula *ἐν κυρίῳ* (about twenty-one times), and therefore Christ as the *εἷς κύριος* is put, Eph. iv. 5, 6, in contrast to the *εἷς θεός*, although here also God seems to be sometimes designated as the *κύριος* (Eph. v. 10, 17, 19; Col. iii. 13, read *ὁ κύριος*). Besides the solemn formula quoted in the text, this name of dignity joined to the personal name occurs more especially in the opening words of the Epistles: *κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός* (Eph. i. 2, vi. 23; Philem. 3; Phil. i. 2, iii. 20; comp. *ὁ κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός*: Phil. iv. 23). *κύριος Ἰησοῦς* occurs with differences of reading (Col. iii. 17); it is, however, well established in Philem. 5, and in

as an act of obedience on the part of Christ (Phil. ii. 8), and sometimes as an act of love on our behalf (Eph. v. 2, 25 : ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν). When we obtain in Christ deliverance from guilt (Col. i. 14), which is expressly set forth as identical with forgiveness of sins, there is no necessity, with Pfleiderer, p. 383 [E. T. ii. 112], to see in this a subjective turn of the Pauline ἀπολύτρωσις (§ 80, *c*), as the latter is brought about, according to Eph. i. 7, by the blood of Christ; and it is so represented, Col. ii. 14, figuratively that God has blotted out the handwriting of the law condemning us, and therefore the guilt, which the transgressors of the law had contracted, is regarded as thereby atoned for.[9] Quite as in the earlier Epistles it is the death of Christ by which He brings about the reconciliation of the world with God (Eph. ii. 16; Col. i. 21 ff.), or God Himself makes His peace with the world (ver. 20); quite as in 2 Cor. v. 18 ff. He reconciles the world to Himself by

the formula: ἐν τῷ κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ (Eph. i. 15; Phil. ii. 19). Here also ὁ κύριος Χριστός (Col. iii. 24) is peculiar. The less there can be detected in these variations a fixed rule discernible by an imitator, the more must this harmony be ascribed to identity of authorship. On the other hand, how little can be proved from smaller fluctuations against this identity, is shown by the fact that in the Epistle to the Philippians, which is the least questioned, the solemn formula: ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, does not occur at all; and in the Epistle to Philemon, which, to be sure, has nearly all the formulas, the simple Χριστός occurs only (ver. 6).

[9] This blotting out even appears expressly as the means for the χαρίζεσθαι τὰ παραπτώματα (ii. 13; comp. iii. 13; Eph. iv. 32; and also 2 Cor. ii. 7, 10, xii. 13) for the Jewish Christians. It is therefore, on the other hand, as little said that satisfaction was given to a demand of the law (Gess, p. 239; Pfleiderer, p. 381 [E. T. ii. 110]) as it is Gal. iii. 13. The law is not here looked at so far as it demands punishment from the transgressor, but only in so far as it declares us guilty by transgression. The words, moreover, do not refer to a bond issued by the transgressor himself (Ritschl, ii. p. 250, after von Hofmann; comp. on the other hand, Gess, p. 238), as in what follows the law, which, on account of its (unfulfilled) ordinances, always stood against us as an enemy, is declared to be taken ἐκ μέσου by its being nailed to the cross, and that can be nothing but a figurative expression for the open proclamation of its removal by Christ's death on the cross. Still less can the words mean that the nailing to the cross, as Ritschl will have it (while he makes the law to have been nailed with Christ), represents the death of Christ as a sacrifice, so far as it avails for the shedding of blood. Even in this the doctrinal expressions used in our Epistles correspond to those of the earlier Epistles, that, Eph. iv. 30 (ἡμέρα ἀπολυτρώσεως) quite as 1 Cor. i. 30, this redemption from guilt is regarded as one definitely coming to pass at the judgment; and, Eph. i. 14, ἀπολύτρωσις with a genitive of closer definition (as Rom. viii. 23) occurs in another than in this technical sense.

Christ, so that even here a subjective turn (Pfleiderer, p. 381 [E. T. ii. 110]), or at any rate a transference of reconciliation to Christ (Pfleiderer, p. 444 [E. T. ii. 175]), which would, indeed, be the case in Col. i. 21 ff., is not to be thought of. But if it once becomes quite evident from the constant interchange of *σταυρός* and *αἷμα* that they both designate, in the first place, only the violent death of Christ (comp. § 80 *c*, footnote 9), then in our Epistles, at any rate, the death of Christ is at once put into the point of view of the Old Testament sacrifice (Eph. v. 2).[10] On the other hand, the new life purified from sin is here also, as § 81, *b*, the indirect result of His death as intended by Christ (v. 25–27; Col. i. 22). The result thereby brought about is, that He has acquired the Church to be His own possession by His own blood (Acts xx. 28). It is connected with the practical hortatory tendency of our Epistles that this intended result of Christ's deed of love is put even more strongly than in the earlier Epistles. Finally, by the *δύναμις τῆς ἀναστάσεως* (Phil. iii. 10) is here meant the sealing of the saving significance of the death of Christ in the sense of § 81, *d*; wherefore the mighty power manifested in the resurrection and exaltation of Christ, Eph. i. 19, 20, is the ground of assurance of salvation, and faith so far, Col. ii. 12, is directly characterized as confidence in the mighty power of God, for the "experimental perception" of the powers included in Christ (Gess, p. 306) cannot be called the power of His resurrection.

(*d*) The doctrine of justification (§ 82) is, to be sure, nowhere expressly explained in our Epistles; but when, Phil. iii. 9, to one's own righteousness, which is earned by the law

[10] It is not the giving up of Himself (the *παραδοῦναι ἑαυτόν*) on the part of Christ which is here designated a sacrifice well-pleasing to God, as it ought to be expressly stated, but what Christ gave Himself for in our behalf, and the words in apposition refer to *ἑαυτόν*, and not to the whole clause. The general idea of a sacrifice (*προσφορά*) is more closely defined by *θυσία* as a bloody sacrifice; and as it implies one offered for the good of another, it is characterized as a sin-offering, a point which Pfleiderer, p. 449 [E. T. ii. 181], overlooks. The *term. technicus* (Lev. i. 9: רֵיחַ נִיחוֹחַ לַיהוָה), borrowed from a free-will offering, is used only to bring into yet greater prominence the free willingness of this sacrifice implied in *ἑαυτόν*; and along with that the ground on account of which God could impute to Him the significance of a means of atonement, but scarcely to transfer to Christ the characteristic moment of the burning of a sacrificial animal, as Ritschl, ii. p. 182, thinks.

(namely, by obedience to it), there is opposed the righteousness which is obtained from God (ἐκ Θεοῦ) upon the ground of faith (ἐπὶ τῇ πίστει), and which is hence mediated by faith (ἡ διὰ πίστεως), the essence of Pauline justification is thereby expressed in the most precise way. Just so, Eph. ii. 8, 9, the true Pauline antithesis: διὰ πίστεως . . . οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων, is expressed with reference to the deliverance resulting from grace, a deliverance which presupposes justification. Faith is here often, in the first place, the confident persuasion of the truth of salvation (Eph. i. 13, 19, iv. 5; Phil. i. 25, ii. 17), but yet preponderatingly saving trust in God (Col. ii. 12) or Christ.[11] Neither Eph. iv. 5, where ἐν μιᾷ ἐλπίδι, which must necessarily be taken subjectively, precedes, nor ver. 13, where the likewise subjective καὶ τῆς ἐπιγνώσεως follows, permits us to think of the objective idea of faith as held by the Church (Pfleiderer, p. 455 [E. T. ii. 186]). According to i. 5, Christians are predestinated to sonship (υἱοθεσία, comp. § 83), and therewith to complete salvation; and the essence of sonship consists in this, that they are loved of God (Eph. v. 1; Col. iii. 12: ἠγαπημένοι) as their God (Phil. i. 3, iv. 19), and give to Him their confidence, only that here also the free access to God grounded on this trust is brought into prominence (Eph. iii. 12, ii. 18), which as regards the thing is involved also in Rom. viii. 15, Gal. iv. 6, and has nothing to do with priestly approach to God (Ritschl, ii. p. 210).[12] Here also εἰρήνη designates at one time the fulness of the Christian salvation generally (Col. i. 2; Philem. 3; Eph. i. 2; Phil. i. 2; comp. Eph. ii. 17, vi. 15, 23), at another time the peace of unanimity (Col. iii. 15; Eph. ii. 14, iv. 3); at another, the inner peace of soul which excludes every earthly care (Phil. iv. 7, 9), and the joy,

[11] Here also we have the formulae πίστις and πιστεύειν εἰς Χριστόν (Col. ii. 5; Phil. i. 29; comp. Acts xx. 21, xxvi. 18), πίστις and πιστὸς ἐν Χριστῷ (Col. i. 2, 4; Eph. i. 1, 15), πίστις Χριστοῦ (Phil. iii. 9; Eph. iii. 12). As to πίστις τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, Phil. i. 27, comp. § 82, *d*, footnote 11. It is here also often doubtful which of the two ideas is the more prominent where there is no closer definition (Col. i. 23, ii. 7; Eph. iii. 17, iv. 13, vi. 16, 23).

[12] If, Rom. viii., the metaphorical application of the idea of sonship is only hinted at (§ 83, *d*), it is expressly (Eph. v. 1) set forth as a motive for the exhortation to imitate God, *i.e.* to become like Him in moral nature (comp. § 21, *c*). As that, so it is in harmony with the parænetic character of our Epistles that,

which goes hand in hand therewith (Col. i. 11 ; Phil. i. 18, 25, ii. 2, 17, 18), to which the apostle specially exhorts in the Epistle to the Philippians (iii. 1, iv. 4). Finally, here also is the consciousness of this new relation to God brought about by the Spirit of God (Eph. ii. 18 : ἐν ἑνὶ πνεύματι), which is on that account the seal of perfect salvation (Eph. i. 13, iv. 30 ; comp. § 83, *e*).

§ 101. *The Doctrine of Salvation.*

The doctrine of a living fellowship with Christ resting on the gift of the Spirit in baptism, by which holiness and righteousness are actually produced, is the same in our Epistles as in the earlier ones (*a*). Here also the healthy development of the Christian life depends on the ever fuller realization of that living fellowship, and on the unrestrained activity of the Spirit in believers, by whom the divine work of grace is brought about (*b*). The doctrine of hope, so far as it is more definitely stated, is quite that of the earlier Epistles (*c*). Here also salvation rests ultimately on election and calling by the gospel, the proclaimer of which to the readers is the Apostle to the Gentiles, prepared for this work by revelation (*d*).

(*a*) Baptism is dispensed in the first instance, as § 84, on the ground of faith in the one Lord (Eph. iv. 5 : εἷς κύριος, μία πίστις, ἓν βάπτισμα), and brings with it cleansing from the stains of guilt (v. 26 : καθαρίσας τῷ λουτρῷ τοῦ ὕδατος ; comp. Acts xxii. 16 : βάπτισαι καὶ ἀπόλουσαι τὰς ἁμαρτίας σου), under the supposition, to be sure, of Christ's having given Himself to die (ver. 25), and on the *ground* of a (divine) word of calling (ἐν ῥήματι), which is to be in no way

Phil. ii. 15, the emphasizing of sonship involves the obligation to blameless obedience, as with Peter (§ 45, *d*). Here also is God designated, but only in the standing prayer for blessing in the beginning of the Epistles, as our Father (Eph. i. 2; Col. i. 2; Philem. 3 ; Phil. i. 2); moreover, in Phil. iv. 20, Eph. iv. 6, where the πάντες, from its connection with ver. 7, can, at any rate, be only all Christians, yet Christians are addressed as brethren (Eph. vi. 10 ; Philem. 7, 20 ; Phil. i. 12, iii. 1, 13, 17, iv. 1, 8), and designated such (Col. i. 2, iv. 15 ; Eph. vi. 23 ; Phil. i. 14, iv. 21). The designation of God as πατὴρ τῆς δόξης (Eph. i. 17) has its analogy in 2 Cor. i. 3 (πατὴρ τῶν οἰκτιρμῶν).

regarded as in mystical union with the water of baptism (Pfleiderer, p. 454 [E. T. ii. 186]). But the Christian is at the same time, from the very beginning of his Christian life, *i.e.* from his baptism, in living fellowship with Christ (Eph. ii. 13: *νυνὶ . . . ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ*; comp. v. 8); the result of his appropriation of Christ by faith (Phil. iii. 8: *Χριστὸν κερδαίνειν*) is, that he is found in Christ (ver. 9), and in Him is filled with the fulness of all the blessings of salvation (Col. ii. 10). This form of doctrine, so peculiar to the apostle, is found perfectly carried out in our Epistles in the manner of the earlier Epistles. The Christian is dead with Christ (Col. ii. 20), and is buried with Him in baptism (ii. 12), only that here the being quickened with Him comes expressly into prominence (iii. 1, ii. 12; comp. Eph. ii. 6).[1] For this, here, on account of what follows, cannot possibly mean a new religious quickening by translation into a state of salvation (Pfleiderer, p. 386 [E. T. ii. 116]), as *χαρισάμενος ἡμῖν* designates an act of God, which does not, after all, refer exclusively to the subjects of *συνηγέρθητε*, and cannot explain the way and manner of this, but it can be explained only by "after that." On the other hand, Christ dwells by His Spirit (Phil. i. 19) in the heart (Eph. iii. 17), so that the life of the Christian is only a life of Christ in him (Phil. i. 21; Gal. ii. 20), Christ's heart beats in his heart (ver. 8).[2] But it is here

[1] Christians are therefore brethren in Christ (Col. i. 2; Philem. 16; Phil. i. 14; comp. Col. iv. 7: *σύνδουλος ἐν κυρίῳ*; Eph. vi. 21: *διάκονος ἐν κυρίῳ*), the apostle is a *δέσμιος ἐν κυρίῳ* (Eph. iv. ; comp. Philem. 23; Phil. i. 13), and here also the formula passes gradually over into a designation of the Christian standing as such (Col. iii. 18, 20; Phil. ii. 1: *εἴ τις παράκλησις ἐν Χριστῷ*). Indeed this passage, in which the *ἐν Χριστῷ* is taken up by *κοινωνία τοῦ πνεύματος*, shows plainly how this living fellowship with Christ is brought about by the giving of the Spirit. Comp. also Eph. ii. 21, 22, where *ἐν κυρίῳ* is placed in parallelism with *ἐν πνεύματι*, and the Church in fellowship with Christ is built up into an habitation of God in the Spirit.

[2] Here also the noticeable trinitarian juxtaposition of Christ, or the Lord, the Spirit, and the Father (Eph. iv. 4–6, ii. 18, 22), cannot prove that the Spirit is regarded as a personality, as the Spirit is evidently represented rather, iii. 20 (comp. ver. 16), as the power of God, which works in us and strengthens us for every Christian activity, from which proceeds every blessing (i. 3: *εὐλογία πνευματική*), every insight (Col. i. 9: *σύνεσις πνευματική*; comp. Eph. i. 17: *ἵνα δώῃ ὑμῖν πνεῦμα σοφίας*), and every activity of Christian piety (Col. iii. 16; Eph. v. 19: *ᾠδαὶ πνευματικαί*), and in which one shares (Phil. ii. 1; comp. 2 Cor. xiii. 13, and therewith § 84, *a*, footnote 4).

expressly said, that not only the communication of the Spirit (Eph. i. 13; Phil. i. 27), but also living fellowship with Christ thereby brought about (Col. ii. 12), or the indwelling of Christ with us (Eph. iii. 17), is conditioned by faith, in which therefore this living fellowship is certainly not given. The result of this is a new creation, which is perfected in this living fellowship with Christ (Eph. ii. 10: (*Θεοῦ*) *ἐσμὲν ποίημα, κτισθέντες ἐν Χρ. Ἰησ.*; comp. ver. 15, iv. 24). Here also Christians are holy ones (Col. iii. 12; comp. i. 2, 4, 12, 26; Eph. i. 1, 15, 18, ii. 19, iii. 8, 18, iv. 12, v. 3, vi. 18; Phil. iv. 21, 22), and this on the ground of their living fellowship with Christ (*ἅγιοι ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ*: Phil. i. 1; comp. Eph. ii. 21: *αὔξει εἰς ναὸν ἅγιον ἐν κυρίῳ*), and here is righteousness actually wrought in them (Eph. iv. 24, v. 9; Phil. i. 11); and that the moral new creation of man is not to be put in causal connection with the atonement or with justification, Eph. ii. 15, 16 teaches here, where the former precedes the latter, as 1 Cor. vi. 11 (comp. § 84, *d*, footnote 18).

(*b*) The normal course of development of the Christian life is so conditioned, as, § 86, that the new principle implanted in baptism is ever being realized on all sides. Although each believer is in Christ, and Christ in him, Christ must ever anew make His abode in their hearts (Eph. iii. 17) till He becomes all in all (Col. iii. 11). They have to be kept in living fellowship with Christ (Phil. iv. 7), and to continue to stand (iv. 1); from *νήπιοι ἐν Χριστῷ* they have even to become *τέλειοι ἐν Χριστῷ* (Col. i. 28), rooted firmly in Him (ii. 7), continuing to walk in Him (ver. 6).[3] More particularly, there is here participation in the sufferings of Christ, which the Christian has to endure (Phil. iii. 10), till the measure of the afflictions Christ endured is also fulfilled in him (Col. i. 24). But he in whom Christ dwells is constantly strengthened (Eph. iii. 16, 17) and renewed (iv. 23) by His

[3] For the Christian exercises all the functions of his life in Him; in Him, or in fellowship with Him, are rooted trust (Phil. ii. 24), hope (ver. 19), joy (iii. 1, iv. 4, 10), boldness (Philem. 8), and Christian refreshment (ver. 20). In Him one speaks (Eph. iv. 17), executes His ministry (Col. iv. 17), entertains another (Phil. ii. 29), in Him keeps unanimity with each other (iv. 2), in Him one obeys another (Eph. vi. 1), in Him is one strengthened (ver. 10) and can do all things (Phil. iv. 13).

Spirit; only by the help of this Spirit can one receive all things which one requires for the preservation of the Christian life (Phil. i. 19), only by Him can one really serve God (iii. 3).[4] A progressive renewal is also here required. Although the σῶμα τῆς σαρκός is put off in baptism (Col. ii. 11), yet the old man needs ever again to be put off, and the new man ever more to be put on (iii. 9, 10; Eph. iv. 22, 24); the holiness which the Christian possesses must be ever more perfectly realized (v. 26, 27; comp. i. 4), till he becomes quite clean and without offence, filled with the fruits of righteousness (Phil. i. 11). On this account the Christian must ever anew prove the difference of good from evil (ver. 10), and learn to recognise the will of God (Col. i. 9, iv. 12; Eph. v. 10, 17; comp. the beautiful exposition by Ritschl, ii. p. 287). To this the apostle leads him on by referring to his own example (Phil. iii. 17, iv. 9; comp. i. 30), as also to the pattern of Christ (Eph. v. 2; Phil. ii. 5), by his own regulations, to which the churches have to give obedience (Phil. ii. 12; Philem. 21), as also by reference to Scripture (Eph. v. 14); and it is not un-Pauline, according to § 87, *d*, if he is stirred up by a command of the Decalogue (vi. 2). Here, also, the apostle draws motives from the fundamental facts of salvation: they are to forgive as they have been forgiven (iv. 32); they are to walk worthy of their Christian calling (iv. 1), or of Christ (Col. i. 10), and of the gospel by him (Phil. i. 27); they are to consider that they have been created for good works, which God has before appointed as the element of the new life, in which they are to walk henceforth and bear fruit (Eph. ii. 10; Col. i. 10). But so strongly does the hortative element of our Epistles come into view, that the apostle makes the readers themselves answerable for the progress of their Christian life, so earnestly must the Christian be ever struggling forwards (Phil. iii. 12, 13), so

[4] It depends on this, that one has and keeps his life's element in this Spirit (Phil. i. 27: στήκετε ἐν . . . πνεύματι; comp. Eph. vi. 18: προσεύχεσθαι ἐν πνεύματι; Col. i. 8: ἀγάπην ἐν πνεύματι), preserves the unity of this Spirit, while one allows no other spirit to influence him (Eph. iv. 3). Here also πνεῦμα designates the spiritual life of the Christian (Philem. 25; Phil. iv. 23), but the Spirit of God dwelling in us yet remains quite objective, as it can be vexed (Eph. iv. 30), and, according to v. 18, may be ever given anew, until the believer is quite filled with the Spirit.

evidently is it divine grace here above all which ultimately works all in him. He who has begun the good work in them will also perfect it (i. 6).[5] Here then, therefore, finally, the Christian can do nothing else but allow grace to work in him, while he continues in the faith (Col. i. 23), and is established in it (ii. 7), and he remains answerable for it only when he shuts himself out from its activity, or hinders it.

(*c*) Along with faith and love there is, as 1 Cor. xiii. 13, hope (comp. § 96), the object of which, as Rom. viii. 24, is not yet in sight, because it is laid up in heaven; a principal moment in the subjective life of the Christian (Col. i. 4, 5), Christ is its author (i. 27: ἡ ἐλπίς), and the Holy Spirit is its pledge (Eph. i. 14, iv. 30). The object of hope is here in the first place salvation (i. 13) from perdition (Phil. i. 28; comp. ii. 12), a salvation which the Lord, looked for from heaven, and whose coming is at hand (iv. 5; comp. § 98, *a*), will bring (iii. 20) as the Saviour (Eph. v. 23). Here also deliverance already results ideally from this, that the Christian has been quickened from the death of sin to a new life with Christ (ii. 5, 6), because the cause of destruction has been thereby removed. The positive correlative of salvation is here also ζωή (Phil. ii. 16, iv. 3). Life, as it shall be lived one day with the exalted Christ, is as yet hidden, because the exalted Christ is as yet hidden, because it is only appointed for them in the counsels of God (Col. iii. 3; comp. i. 5); but it will be manifested when Christ, the author of this life, shall be manifested in glory (§ 98, *a*); there they shall then share that glory with Him (iii. 4), and that is also spoken of (i. 27) as the object of

[5] It is the surpassing greatness of the power of God which helps believers to the completion of their salvation (Col. i. 11; Eph. i. 19), while God arms them with all weapons needful for victory in the Christian fight (vi. 10–13), and for the fulfilment of their calling (Col. i. 29). He strengthens the power to patience and long-suffering (i. 11: μακροθυμία; comp. Jas. v. 10), and righteous suffering is a gift of His grace (Phil. i. 29). But He works this on the ground of prayer (Col. iv. 2; Eph. iii. 20; Phil. iv. 6) and of Christian intercession (i. 19); on this account, for every blessing in the Christian standing of the readers, thanks are given to Him (Col. i. 3; Philem. 4; Eph. i. 16; Phil. i. 3; comp. iv. 7, 9). How little this forms to the apostle a contradiction to that personal responsibility of the Christian is shown by Phil. ii. 12, 13, where the exhortation to work out their complete salvation with fear and trembling is made to depend on this, that God works all in all, the willing and the doing, that He provides for them everything they require, and so there remains for them no excuse if they do not reach the goal.

hope. Then the change resulting on the body, which corresponds to the earthly humiliation, into the shining form of the glorified body of Christ (§ 97, *b*), forms also the correlative, Phil. iii. 21, to the expected salvation, ver. 20. As § 99, *b*, so Paul (Phil. iii. 11) also knows only of a resurrection of those believers kept in living union with Christ (ver. 9), a resurrection which is based on Christ, the ἀρχή (namely, τῶν ἐγερθέντων) or the πρωτότοκος ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν (Col. i. 18; comp. Acts xxvi. 23). As § 97, *c*, so here the inheritance of believers stands (Eph. i. 14, 18) related to their adoption (vv. 5, 17); yet, Col. iii. 24 (comp. Acts xx. 32, xxvi. 18), κληρονομία appears to occur in the more general sense of the possession of salvation promised to the Christians, a possession which is realized in the perfected kingdom of God (iv. 11; Eph. v. 5).[6] Here also, as § 98, *b*, the day of Christ brings (Phil. i. 6, 10, ii. 16) the decision which of the Christians is found approved,[7] and, Eph. v. 21, Christ is evidently regarded as the judge whom Christians have to fear. Here also the retribution (ἀνταπόδοσις) which they will then receive from the Lord is spoken of (Col. iii. 24); the exactness of this retribution is expressed in the sharpest terms, Eph. vi. 8,

[6] To be sure, here also the apostle hopes, in the event of his suffering a martyr's death (Phil. i. 20, ii. 17), directly after death (but certainly not by a resurrection, as Schenkel, p. 294 ff., thinks) to go to Christ, as only on this supposition the immediate departure from life can be to him gain (i. 21, 23; comp. § 96, *d*); and the opinion, that this was regarded only as a prerogative of martyrs (Zeller in the *Theol. Jahrbüchern*, 1847, 3, pp. 402–407), is altogether arbitrary (comp. Köstlin, p. 286). Yet here also this σὺν Χριστῷ εἶναι is not the highest goal of Christian hope. If, moreover, the more particular dealing with eschatological proceedings is reserved in the four principal Epistles, to a yet greater extent is this the case in our Epistles, without its being possible to show any essential change on the supposition on these points.

[7] Not only do heathenish sins exclude from the kingdom of God (Eph. v. 5), but there is required even an uninterrupted approval in the fulfilment of the special Christian calling, by which Christ is glorified (Phil. i. 20), if the end of the Christian life is to be the salvation (ver. 19); as also, according to iv. 3, the names of true fellow-workers in the gospel stand in the book of life. Here also, in particular, it is the stedfastness, which does not permit one to be intimidated even in any point by opponents, which avails to the true contenders as the God-appointed indications of their sure deliverance (i. 28; comp. ver. 20), as they thereby experience the highest proof of their living union with Christ in their fellowship in His sufferings, which makes them conformed to His death (iii. 10), and on that account opens up to them the prospect of the experience of the resurrection from the dead (ver. 11).

Col. iii. 25, in this way, that one receives what one has done (comp. Phil. iv. 18: πεπλήρωμαι . . .; ver. 19: ὁ Θεός μου πληρώσει), and, Eph. vi. 3, an Old Testament retributive prophecy referring to the earthly life is reproduced. Here also the reward appears under the image of fruit, which is produced, and produces at the same time blessing (Phil. iv. 17); or under that of the praise of victory, which God has set forth in the end for the runners of the Christian race (iii. 14); and the reward which Paul specially expects for his work is the glory he will share on the day of Christ (ii. 16, iv. 1; comp. § 98, *d*, footnote 6).

(*d*) The Epistle to the Ephesians begins with thanksgiving for the election of Christians (i. 4), and shows that the object of this election is here also the realization of holiness, and of the salvation of Christians given with sonship (vv. 4, 5; comp. Col. iii. 12: ἐκλεκτοὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἅγιοι καὶ ἠγαπημένοι; comp. § 100, *d*), a salvation God has predestinated for them in love. The names of those so elected stand, according to Phil. iv. 3, in the book of life, to which they are appointed. Here also election follows according to the free good pleasure of God's will (Eph. i. 5) by His grace (ver. 6). Here also are Christians, as § 88, *d*, called of God (Phil. iii. 14: ἡ ἄνω κλῆσις τοῦ Θεοῦ), and so called, to be sure, that by the calling they are united into one body (Col. iii. 15; Eph. iv. 4). The calling is therefore here also the introduction to the Christian Church, and involves equally the determination to a holy walk (iv. 1) as the hope of complete salvation (i. 18, iv. 4; comp. Phil. iii. 14). The calling is here also effected by the gospel (Eph. iii. 6) or the word of God,[8] which, as the sword of the Spirit, *i.e.* as the instrument by which the Spirit of God works (vi. 17), produces faith. For this (Phil. i. 29) is expressly designated a χάρισμα, and God is thanked for the faith of the readers (Col. i. 3, 4; Eph. i. 15, 16). Here also, as § 89, is Paul called by the will of God (Col. i. 1; Eph. i. 1) the

[8] Hence it is also called the word simply (Col. iv. 3; Phil. i. 14), or the word of the truth (Col. i. 5; Eph. i. 13), which is preached by human instrumentality (κηρύσσειν: Col. i. 23; Phil. i. 15). Its content is Christ (Col. iii. 16: ὁ λόγος τοῦ Χριστοῦ; Phil. i. 27: εὐαγγ. τ. Χρ.; comp. i. 15, 17, 18; Col. i. 28), or the salvation given in Him (Eph. i. 13: εὐαγγ. τ. σωτηρίας; vi. 15: τῆς εἰρήνης; comp. ii. 17, iii. 8; Phil. ii. 16: λόγος ζωῆς), and the divine grace (Acts xx. 24, 32).

apostle of Jesus Christ (Eph. iii. 5; comp. Acts. xx. 24), and that specially for the heathen (ver. 1; comp. Col. i. 23–28; Acts xxvi. 17), wherein he sees grace given specially to him as the least of all saints (Eph. iii. 2, 8).[9] This calling was a direct laying hold of him by the Lord (Phil. iii. 12). Finally, the mystery of salvation was made known to the apostle by revelation through the Spirit (Eph. iii. 3: *κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν ἐγνωρίσθη*; comp. ver. 5), so that he could himself announce again this mystery (vi. 19, i. 9; Col. i. 27). With the manner in which this mystery is conceived of in our Epistles, is connected specially their peculiarity.

§ 102. *The Doctrine of Wisdom.*

The message of salvation of the apostle is, to be sure, in the earlier Epistles, in the first place, the contrast to all human wisdom; but it contains yet the true wisdom, so far as it alone shows the way of salvation given in Christ (*a*). Connected with this there is also in Christianity a higher wisdom and knowledge; but, to be sure, in this life these remain ever imperfect (*b*). In opposition to a false doctrine of wisdom in the Epistles of the imprisonment, the gospel is with special emphasis conceived of as the true wisdom, and advancement in the right knowledge is put as task of the normal development of Christian life (*c*). But this true wisdom and knowledge are here also, at the same time, directed to the practical task of the moral life, whose proper solution appears as a second principal task of our Epistles, with their predominant hortative character (*d*).

(*a*) The message of salvation was to the apostle primarily the most complete contrast to all the wisdom of this world, whether this latter now comes forward as Jewish learning in the Scriptures, or as Gentile argumentative skill (1 Cor. i. 20). God has turned this wisdom into folly in this way, that He exhibited its complete inadequacy to find out a way of salva-

[9] Here also Paul calls himself a *δοῦλος* of Christ (Phil. i. 1), and this together with one of his fellow-labourers (*συνεργός*: Col. iv. 11; Philem. 1, 24; Phil. ii. 25, iv. 3), whom he also calls *δοῦλοι* (Col. iv. 12) or *διάκονοι* (Col. i. 7, iv. 7) of Christ. If the destination of salvation for the heathen is, according to Eph. iii. 5, made known to other apostles also, Gal. ii. 7, 8 shows that this cannot be un-Pauline, as Pfleiderer, p. 446 [E. T. ii. 177], supposes.

tion (comp. §' 69, *c*), and determined, on the contrary, to deliver believers by a preaching which took nothing from this wisdom, and from its standpoint was folly (ver. 21: *διὰ τῆς μωρίας τοῦ κηρύγματος*; comp. ver. 18), which even, according to § 89, *a*, on principle rejected, and must reject, all mingling with human wisdom (iv. 10: *μωροὶ διὰ Χριστόν*; comp. iii. 18). But yet this saving message need not be ashamed in the presence of the wise of this world (Rom. i. 16; comp. ver. 14); for it can, what yet every form of wisdom strove ultimately to do, and no human wisdom could achieve (1 Cor. ii. 8), show to men the way of salvation. From this point of view the gospel is not only the power of God, but also the wisdom of God (i. 24); because it announces Him to us who is made wisdom to us by God (ver. 30), and so much so, that even in the simplest form of its proclamation it is always yet wiser (ver. 25) than men, as they strive after (ver. 22) wisdom in vain. But this wisdom brings no theoretical knowledge of God's nature and of divine things, but the knowledge of salvation given in Christ.[1] The truth which the gospel makes known (2 Cor. vi. 7, iv. 2; comp. 2 Thess. ii. 10, 12, 13) is, in contrast to Jewish errors (Gal. ii. 5, 14; comp. v. 7), the true way of salvation; and the Jews, who do not receive it, because they imagine they receive in the law the satisfying *μόρφωσις τῆς γνώσεως κ. τ. ἀληθείας* (Rom. ii. 20), are zealous for God *ἀλλ' οὐ κατ' ἐπίγνωσιν* (x. 2). The true knowledge of God, which casts down all human thoughts, leads to obedience to Christ (2 Cor. x. 5; comp. § 82, *d*), as also to an ever more glorious form of spiritual life (iii. 18; comp. § 86, *c*,

[1] In opposition to heathenism, Christianity has, at any rate, the knowledge of God (Gal. iv. 9), and it is thereby light in opposition to darkness (2 Cor. vi. 14; comp. 1 Thess. v. 4, 5: *οὐκ ἐστὲ ἐν σκότει = υἱοὶ φωτός ἐστε*), as in a certain sense the Jews wished to be in opposition to the Gentiles (Rom. ii. 19). But if the apostle describes his preaching as a making known a savour of the knowledge of God (2 Cor. ii. 14), he adds, that the bearer of this sweet smell is a savour of Christ (ver. 15), *i.e.* that it deals with the knowledge of God in the way it is given in Christ. For to refer this passage to the giving up of Himself on the part of Christ in the fire of sacrifice (Ritschl, ii. p. 183) is quite contrary to the whole context. And if (2 Cor. iv. 6) the activity of God, by which He causes the true knowledge to shine into the heart, is compared to the creation of light (Gen. i. 3), then the object of this knowledge is expressly said to be the glory of God, revealed in the face of Jesus Christ, whom the gospel proclaims as the image of God in His glory (ver. 4).

footnote 7), and fits them to show each other practically the right way (Rom. xv. 14). If the apostle wishes that his readers may be *σοφοὶ εἰς τὸ ἀγαθόν* (xvi. 19), this from the context refers chiefly to their keeping hold of right doctrine (ver. 17), which of itself serves to turn away the erroneous demands of Judaizers. True wisdom, hence, consists in the knowledge of the right way of salvation, and is thoroughout of a practical character.

(*b*) From the simple message of salvation Paul, 1 Cor. ii. 6, distinguishes the *σοφία*, which he proclaimed among mature Christians (*ἐν τοῖς τελείοις*), while he presented food suitable for children (iii. 2), namely milk, and not strong food, to the immature (the *νηπίοις*). But even this had nothing in common with the wisdom of the world, but is a deeper insight into the hidden saving purpose of God (ver. 7: *Θεοῦ σοφίαν ἐν μυστηρίῳ τὴν ἀποκεκρυμμένην*), as God has revealed it by His Spirit to the apostles (ver. 10), and as it can on that account be understood and judged of by the spiritual (vv. 14, 15). To this belongs, *e.g.*, insight into the depths of God's wisdom (Rom. xi. 33; comp. 1 Cor. ii. 10), which were opened up to the apostle by meditation on the wonderful ways of God by which salvation has come, and must come, to its universal realization. More especially insight into the eschatological mysteries belongs to this, which, according to § 92, *b*, footnote 8, are revealed by the gift of prophecy (*λόγος σοφίας*: 1 Cor. xii. 8). There also we saw that along with this there is also a gift of deeper knowledge of the truths of salvation (*λόγος γνώσεως*: xii. 8; comp. xiii. 2, xiv. 6), in which the Corinthians were specially rich (i. 5, iv. 10; 2 Cor. viii. 7), even as Paul himself was (vi. 6, xi. 6). But there are also generally different grades of knowledge in the churches, such as that which is shown, *e.g.*, in judging indifferent things (1 Cor. viii. 7, 10, 11). But all knowledge without love is worthless (xiii. 2); it may even, if it puffs up, become dangerous (viii. 1, 2); like all gifts, it is transitory (xiii. 8), and remains ever partial (vv. 9–11), till it gives place at the Parousia to perfect knowledge (*ἐπίγνωσις*: ver. 12). Comp. § 93, *a*.

(*c*) Although even in the earlier Epistles the gospel is from one point of view a philosophy, and also offers to the more

mature and gifted Christians a higher wisdom, it yet comes into view that in the Epistles of the Imprisonment the ideas of wisdom and knowledge play a disproportionately important part. The reason of this is the emergence in the churches of Asia Minor of a new philosophy which offers to conduct believers to a higher stage of knowledge (§ 59, *c*), but which yet Paul can only look on as a relapse into the *στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου*, because it has to do with theosophic traditions (*κατὰ τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν ἀνθρώπων*), and therefore with a *φιλοσοφία* (Col. ii. 8) in the sense of human wisdom, as it forms the contrast, according to note *a*, to the gospel. In opposition to this, Paul must bring into greater prominence how undoubtedly the goal of Christianity is the whole riches of insight (*σύνεσις*) fully assured to themselves, perfect knowledge (*ἐπίγνωσις*: ver. 2), but that the contents of this knowledge is no sort of theosophic doctrine, but the mystery of salvation (*τὸ μυστήριον τοῦ Θεοῦ*), in which are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge (ver. 3). The designation of the divine saving purpose as a mystery is common to our Epistles with the earlier ones (§ 100, *c*); but the striking prominence of this idea in the former may well be connected with the opposition to the false teachers, who pretended to reveal mysteries not yet disclosed. But the content of the mystery by whose disclosure God has most richly shown His grace in all wisdom and knowledge (*φρόνησις*), which He has bestowed on us, is, according to Eph. i. 8, 9, His will directed for our salvation (vv. 5, 11: *ἡ βουλὴ τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ*; comp. Acts xx. 27); according to iii. 9, the institution of salvation, which makes known the gospel, and which by its realization in the *ἐκκλησία* makes known to the heavenly powers the manifold wisdom of God (ver. 10); according to Col. i. 26, God's promise (*ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ*: ver. 25), which is fulfilled by the preaching of the word (comp. *τὸ μυστήριον τοῦ Χριστοῦ*: Col. iv. 3; Eph. iii. 4).[2] If now, according to note *b*, the eschatological

[2] The philosophy of our Epistles is accordingly no transcendental speculation, as Baur, p. 264, imagines, when he here looks upon everything under the point of view of the metaphysical necessity of the process of the idea realizing itself; and, p. 273, in the emphasizing of a wisdom and knowledge which, released from its union with faith, comes into view as an independent moment of religious consciousness, he recognises the approach of the Gnostic period. Even here, too, the object of knowledge is the grace of God (Col. i. 6) as the basis of the

mysteries in particular are the object of Christian philosophy, then Christ is here, so far as He is the author of the hope of coming glory (§ 101, *c*), the content of the mystery of salvation which is now being made known (Col. i. 27; comp. i. 5, 6), and therefore Christians, because they possess the word of life, are light-bearers in the world (Phil. ii. 15, 16). But that is also the peculiarity of our Epistles, that every prayer for the further development of Christians is concentrated in this, that the Spirit of wisdom and revelation may lead them to the knowledge of God (Eph. i. 17), a knowledge which teaches to what a hope God has called us (ver. 18), and how great His power is by which He conducts us to this goal (ver. 19). Likewise, the perfection of the Church is sought (iv. 13) in the unity, *i.e.* in the equal development, of knowledge in all, or is made dependent on it (iii. 19; comp. Col. ii. 2, 3). The more the healthy development of the Christian life is endangered by theosophic false teaching in the region of knowledge, all the more must it be counterworked by the presentation of the gospel as the true philosophy, and by the promotion of real knowledge.

(*d*) By this conception of philosophy and of the knowledge thereby aimed at, this philosophy must also have necessarily a directly practical side. To be sure, here the gospel is the word of truth (Col. i. 5; Eph. i. 13), as in note *a*, especially in opposition to the human teaching, which leads away from the truth (Eph. iv. 14; comp. ver. 15: ἀληθεύοντες: those avowing the truth, as Gal. iv. 16; Col. ii. 6, 7; comp. with vv. 4, 8); but even here ἀλήθεια is usually a practical principle, the rule of δικαιοσύνη (§ 100, *a*), true instruction in Jesus is directed to the renewing of the life (Eph. iv. 20, 21).[3] Christian wisdom and intelligence (σύνεσις) is

hope of salvation proclaimed in the gospel (ver. 5), or the Son of God (Eph. iv. 13), in whom we share this grace, *i.e.* Christ as our Lord and Redeemer (Phil. iii. 8), the knowledge of whom only on that account makes everything else seem eclipsed (τὸ ὑπερέχον τῆς γνώσεως), nay, even as something hurtful, which one must throw away, because any other good may hinder us in acknowledging and appropriating Him as the highest good (ver. 8). Hence also the love of Christ may be designated as this object, as it surpasses all human knowledge, and can be apprehended only experimentally (Eph. iii. 19); or the riches of salvation in Christ, unsearchable to human understanding (ver. 8); or the Christian good itself (Philem. 6).

[3] Right doctrine is thus also a tradition of Christ (Col. ii. 6, 7), as it is a

therefore, on the one hand, a knowledge of the divine way of salvation (Eph. i. 9); on the other, a knowledge of the divine authoritative will (Col. i. 9), by which one brings forth fruit in good works, and makes increase (ver. 10: read τῇ ἐπιγνώσει τοῦ Θεοῦ), or walks strictly according to duty (Eph. v. 15, 17); and so σοφία, Col. iv. 5 (comp. 1 Cor. iii. 10, vi. 5; 2 Cor. i. 12), stands directly for the practical wisdom of life.[4] Here also, as in the earlier Epistles, the contrast of the Christian life to the earlier heathen life is that of light to darkness (Eph. v. 8: ἦτε . . . ποτε σκότος, νῦν δὲ φῶς ἐν κυρίῳ; comp. Acts xxvi. 18, 23); but the nature of this enlightenment consists in this, that one proves what is well-pleasing to the Lord (ver. 10); its fruit, in which the works of those walking in a state of unenlightenment are put away (ver. 11: τὰ ἔργα τὰ ἄκαρπα τοῦ σκότους), is the righteousness in which the children of light walk (vv. 8, 9).[5] Yet more decidedly, therefore, than in the earlier Epistles, Christian wisdom and knowledge are here regarded as having moral duties in view. The doctrine of wisdom of our Epistles is accordingly a penetrating into the deeper grounds and into the more comprehensive results of the great facts of Christian salvation, and on the other hand, a yet further carrying of saving truth into practical life, with the varied riches of its concrete relations. We shall have, in what follows, to keep in view the peculiarities of the Epistles of the Imprisonment on both sides.

doctrine of the life of Christian virtue (Phil. iv. 9). The activity of the apostles (Col. i. 28), as of the Church herself, if the word of Christ dwell in her richly (iii. 16), is thus also practical correction (νουθετεῖν), as also instruction (διδάσκειν), and both advance her in that wisdom.

[4] If love is to become rich in knowledge and all kinds of experience (Phil. i. 9), then the ἐπίγνωσις can be only of the kind which points out to love the right way of its activity; while, on the other hand, according to Col. iii. 10, the progressive renewal of the life helps to advance true knowledge, which must in that case be throughout of a practical kind, as, according to Eph. iii. 18, only the being rooted in love can lead to a comprehension of the love of Christ; and, according to v. 14, Christ rises as light to him who wakes up from the death-sleep of sin.

[5] It is therefore also the task of those who have been enlightened to convict others of the sinfulness of their nature (Eph. v. 11), because whenever the sinner has his own nature revealed to him, he becomes himself enlightened (ver. 13); and if, Phil. ii. 15, Christians, as possessing the word of life (ver. 16), shine as light-bearers in the midst of the perverse race of this world, the same task is for them at least indirectly pointed out.

CHAPTER XII.

THE MORE DEVELOPED DOCTRINES.

§ 103. *The Cosmical Significance of Christ.*

The eternal purpose of salvation, on which the salvation of the world depends, was made in Christ, who, as the first-born Son of love, was before all creatures (*a*). It is by Him that the world was created, and He is the end of the development of the world as a whole, which points in this direction, that all things are summed up in Him as the central point of the universe (*b*). The realization of this object of the world was conditioned on His descending to the earth, which is an act of free, willing self-surrender and humiliation (*c*). As the reward for this, He has been raised to full participation in the divine honour and dominion of the world, so that He, in whom all the fulness of the Godhead dwells bodily, now fills the universe governing all (*d*).

(*a*) The teaching of Christian wisdom merges before everything else in the depths of the divine purpose of salvation. That this latter is a purpose before all time, a *πρόθεσις τῶν αἰώνων* (Eph. iii. 11), is taught in our Epistles in complete harmony with the earlier ones. But these latter go a step farther, even to include the election of the individual to be the object for the realization of salvation in this purpose, so that it first comes to be in them an *electio aeterna*. In the heavenly world (*ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις*), God has blessed us with every spiritual blessing, in that He hath chosen us before the foundation of the world (i. 3, 4); and the calling, by which this election is realized, because it proceeds from God, is a heavenly calling (Phil. iii. 14: *ἡ ἄνω κλῆσις*). And if it is said, Eph. iii. 9, that the mystery of salvation was hid from eternity in God, who created the universe, it is indicated by this characteristic of God, that the purpose of salvation is connected in the closest way with the plan of the world, which began to be realized in creation; and that purpose having been formed by the Creator before the creation of the world, was regulative even in its creation. If, even in the

earlier Epistles, the inference backwards from what Christ has become by His exaltation, led to His heavenly origin (§ 79, *b*), then the same inference flows here *à priori* from the thought of the eternal purpose of salvation as having been already formed in Christ (ver. 11). If Christians are chosen in Christ before the foundation of the world (i. 4), and are thereby already blessed in Him in the heavenly world (ver. 3), then the Mediator of salvation, in whom the election and the blessing could be grounded at a time when the objects of these did not exist, must have Himself existed before the world. For us, this line of thought would lead only to an ideal pre-existence of the Redeemer in the divine purpose; for Paul, there is at once an eternal divine existence of the Christ who in His earthly life has become the Mediator. As the elect are now to be in Him sharers in the love of God, which was guaranteed to them when destined to sonship (Col. iii. 12; Eph. i. 5), then must He Himself be the Beloved *κατ' ἐξοχήν* (ver. 6), the highest object of this love (Col. i. 13: *ὁ υἱὸς τῆς ἀγάπης αὐτοῦ*); and here also, as § 77, *c*, the name of Son designates Him as such (Eph. iv. 13: *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ*; comp. *Θεὸς πατήρ*: Phil. ii. 11; Col. i. 3, iii. 17; *Θεὸς καὶ πατήρ*: Eph. i. 3, v. 20, only in doxologies). He must be before all (Col. i. 17: *πρὸ πάντων*), as, in conformity to His relation with God as the First-born, He rises far above every creature (ver. 15: *πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως*).[1]

(*b*) If the divine purpose of salvation was already regulative for the creation of the world, then must salvation as well as creation be grounded on the original Mediator. His position

[1] Even in a purely linguistic point of view, this expression cannot mean that He was the first-born creature among all creatures, as Usteri, p. 315; Reuss, ii. p. 75 [E. T. ii. 64]; Baur, p. 257, understand, for then *πάσης κτίσεως* would be a *partitive genitive:* for only a plural or collective notion could designate a category or a universality to which an individual belongs. But as *πάσης κτίσεως* indicates each single creature, the genitive can only be understood as a *comparative genitive*, and can mean only that He in comparison with any other creature was the first-born (comp. Immer, p. 372). There is implied in *πρωτότοκος*, therefore, at any rate, something which distinguishes Him above every creature, as He is equally put by vv. 16, 17, in a relation to the whole creation, which excludes the very possibility of regarding Him as in any sense a creature. That He is called, not the only Son, but the First-born, can therefore have no reference to this, that the creature is, in a certain sense, conceived as later born (comp. Schmidt, p. 212), but, according to what is said in the text, only to His

of dignity in relation to every creature (Col. i. 15) depends on the fact that the universe was created in Him (ver. 16 : ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ ἐκτίσθη τὰ πάντα). But that all creation should be thus grounded in Him includes a twofold idea, namely, that not only were all things created by Him (δι' αὐτοῦ), which the earlier Epistles teach (§ 79, *c*), but also that all was created for Him (εἰς αὐτόν), who is to bring to completion both the saving purpose of God, as also the whole development of the world, which tends towards the realization of the purpose of God. And because the world has not yet reached this goal, then all things have progressively their existence in Him (ver. 17), and it cannot fail, because the goal of the world established in Him must be realized. But how this goal of the world is conceived of, Eph. i. 10 shows, when it is mentioned as the final goal of the institution of God's grace, that all things may be gathered together in Christ as in a centre (ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι τὰ πάντα ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ). He has been appointed to be this central point of the universe, as the universe was created in Him; but here it is pointed out that He must again become so, because a dislocation in the original constitution of the world has taken place by sin, whose removal again the dispensation of grace must have in view.[2] By this conception of Christ as the principle and also the goal of the world, which latter, according to the earlier Epistles (§ 99, *d*), is God Himself, the Christology of our Epistles goes beyond that of the earlier Epistles. It is connected with this idea, that the goal of the world is no longer regarded as the perfected kingdom of God, in which

relation to those who in Him are destined to attain similarly to sonship with God. But that He is for all creatures the First-born, *i.e.* the Opener of the divine life, the Mediator of the divine love, is arbitrarily imported into the idea of πρωτότοκος by Gess, p. 274 ff. (comp. also Schenkel, p. 280 ff., who, moreover, finds no pre-existence in our Epistles; comp. p. 289).

[2] I see no reason, with Schmidt, p. 185 (comp. Hofmann *in loc.*), to weaken or deny the force of the composite word, as it is not the original goal of the world which is here referred to, but that which is to be reached by the institution of grace; and that, according to Col. i. 20, is reached in Christ by a restoration removing the whole alienation wrought by sin. It was very easy, no doubt, to suppose that the sinful development of the world foreseen by God was *à priori* included in the world's plan; but as both passages refer exclusively to the actual realization of the purpose of salvation, this thought is not indicated.

the absolute universal Lordship of God is realized, in contrast to the earthly mediatorial lordship of Christ, which the latter gives back to the Father, according to § 99, *c* (comp. § 76, *c*), but as the *βασιλεία τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ Θεοῦ* (Eph. v. 5), and that the exaltation of Christ is extended over everything which has a name both in this world and in the future (i. 21; comp. Schmidt, p. 198). One cannot think of the goal of the world without Him in whom even creation has its root.

(*c*) In order to lead the world created in Him to the goal appointed for it in the pre-temporal purpose of salvation, Christ has to become the Redeemer, and as such to descend from His heavenly existence to the earthly (Eph. iv. 10).[3] But His descent is at the same time a transition from the form of existence corresponding to His heavenly existence to the earthly-human, in which form alone He could perform the office of a Redeemer. As *ἐπουράνιος* He was in the form of God (*ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ*: Phil. ii. 6), *i.e.* He possessed the divine *δόξα*, the form of manifestation corresponding to the divine spiritual nature, consisting of supersensual light-substance (§ 76, *d*).[4] In this His glory He might have appeared in the

[3] It is He who *καταβάς*; and it is a mistake when Baur, p. 260, asserts that this descending is a deduction from the ascension of Christ, while in simple contradiction the proof that the passage from the Psalm (lxviii. 19) cited in Eph. iv. 8, which speaks of an ascending, applies to Christ, depends on this, that (on the supposition that the words refer to a heavenly being) only from a *καταβάς* can anything be said of an *ἀνέβη* (ver. 9). For, moreover, the *κατέβη εἰς τὰ κατώτερα τῆς γῆς* cannot refer, as he supposes, to the descent of Christ to hell,—an idea, however, which Gess, p. 248 ff., and Schenkel, p. 290, hold fast,—but to the descent to the earth, which is designated the lower region in opposition to the *εἰς ὕψος* of the Psalm (comp. Schmidt, p. 202 ff.; Pfleiderer, p. 439, footnote [E. T. ii. 170]; Immer, p. 378).

[4] That the words here refer to Christ in His pre-temporal existence, Schmidt, p. 163 ff., Gess, p. 311 ff., have afresh decisively proved, against Beyschlag, p. 233 ff. The identification of the *μορφὴ Θεοῦ* with the *δόξα* depends on this, that here also the *δόξα*, which the perfected attain to (§ 101, *c*), and which belongs to the glorified body of Christ (Phil. iii. 21), belongs originally to God, who is called, Eph. i. 17, the *πατὴρ τῆς δόξης*, and therefore on that account it belongs to the Son of His love (note *a*) in His original heavenly existence. Besides this technical use of *δόξα*, it occurs here also, to be sure, to denote the fulness of the divine glory generally (Col. i. 11; Eph. i. 12, 14, iii. 16), and is then applied to everything which belongs to Him (i. 6) or comes from Him (i. 18; comp. Phil. iv. 19). Connected with this, it is spoken of, as § 76, *d*, footnote 8, as honour and praise (Eph. iii. 21; Phil. i. 11, ii. 11, iii. 19, iv. 20). But it is incomprehensible how Pfleiderer, p. 139, footnote [E. T. i. 139], can identify the *μορφὴ Θεοῦ* with the *σῶμα τῆς δόξης*, in order hence to infer that the pre-existent

world, to obtain the divine honour and devotion, by which alone the position assigned to Him towards the world (*τὸ εἶναι ἴσα Θεῷ*)[4] is realized; but He considered not this position of godlike dignity a thing to be seized (*οὐχ ἁρπαγμὸν ἡγήσατο*), *i.e.* something to be selfishly and arbitrarily laid hold on (ver. 6). He rather emptied Himself and divested Himself of whatever it was He possessed, namely the *μορφὴ Θεοῦ*, while He assumed the *μορφὴ δούλου* (ver. 7).[5] Here also, therefore, that *δόξα* is regarded as the form of existence which belonged to Him as the Son (§ 77, *d*), and the giving up of it as the entrance upon that servantship which is inadequate to His original position as Son (comp. § 79, *b*), which He assumed in submission to the divine will, in contra-distinction to any obstinate *ἁρπαγμός*. He would, no doubt, have stood in such a position had He entered on any other higher order of God's creatures, and so the form in which He took servantship had to be more closely defined, that He came in human likeness (ver. 7: *ἐν ὁμοιώματι ἀνθρώπων γενόμενος*),[6] from which it is brought forward in what follows, as the final result of the *κένωσις* and the condition of the

Christ is regarded as a heavenly man (comp. on the other hand, § 79, *a*, footnote 3, and Biedermann, p. 241, who finds, to be sure, in the later Pauline Epistles a tendency to the idea of a Divine Being, who takes a human form of existence). For nowhere is *σῶμα* attributed to God; and the assertion that the image of God referred to here includes the idea of a human archetype, lacks every sort of proof. Schenkel, p. 296, thinks only of the image of God in Adam, while here also he denies any pre-existence.

[5] The correct interpretation of this passage, which Schmidt and Pfleiderer maintain, depends on the correct distinction between *τὸ εἶναι ἴσα Θεῷ*, which was only appointed for Christ, and the *μορφὴ Θεοῦ*, which He already possesses in His pre-temporal existence, and this is necessarily required by any exact interpretation of *ἁρπαγμός*. When Hofmann *in loc.* again makes the latter to be but the manifestation of the former, and Gess, p. 317, inclines so far to an identification of the two, the former must take *ἁρπαγμός* in the sense of *actus rapiendi*, which, without an artificial insertion, gives no sense, and with the sense "selected by Him" leads to a quite empty antithesis. As for that violent acquisition, no object is imaginable, and the latter (as also Schenkel, p. 296 ff.) takes *ἁρπαγμός* = *ἅρπαγμα*, which is acknowledged to be contrary to the meaning of the word, and requires an arbitrary filling up of the main thought (p. 315 ff.).

[6] It is not therewith certainly to be said that He was not a true human subject, but that He took only for a time a human form (Baur, p. 269), which is certainly excluded by the continuance of the *μορφὴ ἀνθρώπου* in His *σῶμα τῆς σαρκός*; it is rather implied that, although He became man, yet, in contrast to the human race descended from Adam, He came as the Second Man, in whom a

ταπείνωσις, that He surrendered all the claims His peculiar nature nevertheless gave Him, and in the whole representation of His life as a man was found all as other men (ver. 7: σχήματι εὑρεθεὶς ὡς ἄνθρωπος). Therewith is particularly connected the fact that He subjected Himself (§ 78, *c*) to the weakness of mortal flesh (comp. Col. i. 22: ἐν τῷ σώματι τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ; Eph. ii. 15: ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ αὐτοῦ), from which the πνεῦμα which dwelt in Him, and the sinlessness thereby imparted to Him, delivered Him. Thus only could He in obedience to God humble Himself to the shameful death of the cross (Phil. ii. 8), by which, according to § 100, *c*, He became the Redeemer. In the earlier Epistles, also, the earthly life of Christ is conceived of as a voluntary surrender of the riches of His original heavenly life (2 Cor. viii. 9, and therewith § 79, *c*).

(*d*) If the appearance of Christ on the earth took place on the ground of a voluntary self-resignation and self-humiliation, the return to His heavenly existence cannot be understood as the simple natural restoration of His original condition, but only as the divine reward of that act; but it must, at the same time, have given Him more than He possessed, namely, according to note *c*, the εἶναι ἴσα Θεῷ (Phil. ii. 9: διὸ καὶ ὁ Θεὸς αὐτὸν ὑπερύψωσεν; comp. Schmidt, p. 173), despised by Him by the way of wilful usurpation. To be sure, He who descended has again, suitably to His nature, ascended above all heavens (Eph. iv. 10),[7] and has thus been restored to His original Being; but, according to Col. iii. 1, Eph. i. 20, God, after raising Him from the dead, has set Him at His own right hand in the heavenly world (comp. Rom. viii. 34), and has thus made Him to be absolutely the first (Col. i. 18). This position of dignity, equal with God, He never possessed before (comp. § 79, *d*); the summit of exaltation, to which He has been raised, is expressly so designated, Phil. ii. 9,

higher form of human existence is realized, in virtue of the Divine Spirit dwelling in Him (§ 78, *d*). I regard it as altogether a mistake to refer the words to the human-like birth of Christ, which Hofmann has suggested, to the thoroughly unnatural separation of the words from the preceding; but even a being born into the form of man, namely, in fleshly corporeity (Pfleiderer, p. 150 ff. [E. T. i. 151]), does not answer to the expression.

[7] As to the idea of a plurality of heavens, above which is the dwelling-place of God Himself, comp. 2 Cor. xii. 2.

that God has given Him a name that is above every name, to wit, the name of κύριος in the absolute sense (ver. 11; comp. § 100, *c*); to Him every knee shall bow, and that therefore involves full divine honour and worship (ver. 10; comp. § 76, *b*).[8] It is part of the peculiarity of our Epistles that they repeatedly employ the expression τὸ πλήρωμα to express the essential dominion of the exalted Christ corresponding to this position of divine dignity, answering apparently to a terminology common among false teachers (what Gess, p. 302 f., tries in vain to deny). While these latter, as it seems, supposed the divine essential fulness, *i.e.* the totality of the attributes, powers, and blessings dwelling in God, to be distributed over the whole higher kingdom of spirits, it is emphatically stated, Col. i. 19, that the entire pleroma decided to make its abode in the risen and exalted One (ver. 18), as also, according to Eph. iii. 19, comp. with iv. 13, the πλήρωμα of God and of Christ is identical. But it is peculiar to Christ, that the whole fulness of the Divine Being (θεότης) dwells in Him, σωματικῶς (Col. ii. 9), *i.e.* that Christ, because He is risen, and has thereby received back a human, but at the same time a glorified body (comp. Phil. iii. 21: τὸ σῶμα τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ), possesses the divine fulness of being not in the form of a pure spirit, but so that it is presented in a human body, which is, to be sure, the pure organ of the Spirit (comp. § 76, *d*), because it is not of an earthly material kind, but consists of the heavenly light-substance, which is originally peculiar to God (Eph. i. 17).[9] Even on this

[8] Here too, as in 1 Cor. xv. 27, there is a reference to Ps. viii. 7, according to the Messianic application of which God has put all things under His feet (Eph. i. 22). It is self-evident that this subjection to His kingly rule is brought about only gradually, and, as 1 Cor. xv. 24, with His co-operation, since Phil. iii. 21 speaks of the power of Christ, by which He is in a position to subject all things to Himself, and even to conquer the power of death over our bodies, which, as the last enemy, will be overcome by Christ, 1 Cor. xv. 26. That ii. 10 speaks of a worshipping of Christ, Schenkel, p. 297, again denies.

[9] R. Schmidt, p. 208 ff., and Pfleiderer, p. 375 ff. [E. T. ii. 104], emphatically assert of Col. i. 9, ii. 9, as Gess does of the former passage, that they refer to the earthly appearance of Christ, by which Pfleiderer, p. 377 [E. T. ii. 106], renews so far the untenable meaning of σωματικῶς, "in concrete reality." It was certainly important for the apostle to emphasize the meaning of a concrete bearer of the divine πλήρωμα, one who had appeared in historical reality, in opposition to the phantom spiritual beings of the false teachers, who had to assume such; but the exalted Christ, as He appeared to him (§ 58, *c*), was to him the perfected

account the exalted Christ is called, Col. i. 15, the image of the invisible God (comp. 2 Cor. iv. 4), because in the heavenly radiance of His glorified body, as it appeared to the apostle, the Being of God essentially invisible became manifest.[10] In virtue of this divine fulness dwelling in Him, the exalted Christ (comp. Eph. iv. 10), who yet bears in His glorified body, so to say, the mark of His historical mediatorship, can, in His absolutely universal Lordship, fill the whole universe (i. 23: ὁ τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν πληρούμενος) with His omnipresent and everywhere active Lordship; and if He is thus all in all (comp. Col. iii. 11), as, according to 1 Cor. xv. 28, God alone is, at the end of the world, then is the whole also in Him (comp. for the correlation of these two ideas, § 101,

Redeemer, and, not in the quality of His earthly life, which he had not seen, but in the glorified body of the exalted One, there was given to him the security for the historical reality of the Redeemer (comp. Gess, p. 268). The context in both passages decides in favour of our interpretation; and Pfleiderer, p. 375 [E. T. ii. 104], can get quit of the clear testimony to the contrary of i. 18 only by means of a hypothesis of a "superfluous clause inserted" into the original text, according to which Christ, by His resurrection, is to become the first, simply because the whole πλήρωμα, *i.e.* God, in so far as He is contained in the πλήρωμα (comp. Schmidt, p. 208, and the completely meaningless reasons to the contrary of Immer, p. 373), determined to dwell in the exalted One; and ver. 20 says nothing to the contrary, as Gess supposes, inasmuch as there the εἰρηνοποιεῖν διὰ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ σταυροῦ αὐτοῦ is only the supposition of the final ἀποκαταλλάξαι τὰ πάντα εἰς αὐτόν, which the exalted One will bring about (comp. note *a*, footnote 2), and this is by no means identical with the atonement effected on the cross. But for the peculiar reference of κατοικεῖ, ii. 9, conformable to His nature, to the present condition of the exalted One, the context along with ver. 10 ff. decides, as Gess has already shown. According to Schenkel (pp. 283-5), under πλήρωμα is to be understood, i. 19, the fulness of the created world, ii. 9, the Church filled by God.

[10] From this it certainly follows that the Alexandrian doctrine of the Logos in no way lies at the foundation of this view of Christ, as Usteri, p. 308; Reuss, ii. pp. 73, 74 [E. T. ii. 63, 64]; Baur, p. 256; Beyschlag, p. 229; and Pfleiderer, p. 373 [E. T. ii. 101], assume, because these expressions do not refer to the pre-existent Christ, as Gess, pp. 273, 279, also notices, but to Him in whom we have redemption (ver. 14), and who rules over Christians (ver. 13), *i.e.* to the exalted Christ (comp. also, on the other hand, Schenkel, p. 299). If, therefore, any predicate is directly applied to Him which refers back to His original existence (ver. 15: πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως), and if, vv. 16, 17, things are said of Him which refer to His relation to creation before His incarnation, it only follows from this, that just as from Phil. ii. 6-9, when Jesus Christ (ver. 5) is the identical subject for the original Being ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ, as for the earthly life and exaltation to divine Lordship, so here also, as § 79, *c*, we are not to think of an ideal or impersonal pre-existence, but rather that the pre-existent and the exalted Christ are one and the same person.

a, *b*). According to Eph. i. 10 (comp. note *b*), the end of the world is reached therewith, for all things were created in Him. Thereby also is His abiding central position guaranteed in the perfected world, in contradistinction from the older Epistles (comp. Schmidt, p. 207).[11]

§ 104. *The Work of Salvation in its Cosmical Relation.*

The angels also, all whose ranks belong to the creatures created in Christ, and have been subjected to the exalted Christ, are included in the world's goal that is to be realized in Christ (*a*). On the other hand, the might of the kingdom of darkness appears to be broken by the atoning death of Christ, and its complete subjection certain in the end (*b*). In our Epistles the work of redemption brings to men the restoration of their original relation to God, and their original kinship with God (*c*). Thereby also the opposition between the heavenly and the earthly worlds is here removed for the Christian, his life has already become a heavenly one (*d*).

(*a*) If angels are much more frequently spoken of in our Epistles than in the earlier ones,[1] the reason is evidently this, that the theosophic speculation of that time had much more to do with angels, and, while they were apparently connected with the divine πλήρωμα (§ 103, *a*), and had a sort of

[11] It seems to stand in peculiar contradiction to the high Christology of our Epistles, when God, Eph. i. 17 and Col. ii. 2 (read: τοῦ μυστηρίου τοῦ θεοῦ Χριστοῦ), is called the God of our Lord Jesus Christ, therefore of the exalted One. But this cannot indicate that God is honoured by Christ as God, for that would stand in the sharpest contradiction to the passages in note *d*, but only that the God who has become manifest in Christ is spoken of.

[1] Apart from the Epistles to the Thessalonians, where we meet with angels as the attendants and servants of the returning Christ (§ 64, *a*), they are mentioned only, 1 Cor. iv. 9, in order to describe, along with men, the κόσμος, and, Rom. viii. 38, in order, along with ἀρχαί (which in this place are to be understood as the opposite of earthly rulers), to amplify the idea of πᾶσα κτίσις (ver. 39); finally, 1 Cor. xiii. 1, Gal. iv. 14, when mention is made hypothetically of a higher nature than the human. According to Gal. i. 8, the heavenly beings are connected with the higher world of light (2 Cor. xi. 14: ἄγγελος φωτός), and they have, as in the teaching of Jesus (§ 19, *d*, footnote 6), glorified bodies as the exalted Christ has (1 Cor. xv. 48), which shine in the supermundane splendour of the divine glory (ver. 40; comp. § 76, *d*). According to Gal. iii. 19, the law was given by their mediation, and, 1 Cor. xi. 10, it seems to be supposed that they are present as invisible spectators in the assemblies of the Church.

mediatorship ascribed to them, it proceeded to give them divine honours (Col. ii. 18, 23). The more that the peculiar dignity of Christ was thereby lowered, all the more important did it come to be to the apostle to bring into prominence how even they too belonged to the creatures created in Christ, inasmuch as these comprehend all beings, heavenly and earthly, visible and invisible (i. 16). If their different orders are in this connection mentioned, of which in the earlier Epistles there is scarcely any mention,[2] this happens only for this reason, to bring into prominence the fact, in opposition to the false teachers, who busied themselves with the different classes of angels, that not any of them was excluded from this attribute of creaturehood. But if the angels are included among the creatures created in Christ Jesus, *i.e.* through Him and for Him, then they too must be included in the goal of the world intended in creation. According to Eph. i. 10, in the goal of the divine institution of salvation everything, both in heaven and in earth, will be again gathered together in Christ as its central point (§ 103, *b*). The previous split, hinted at in the composite word, may easily be thought of as brought about by the sin of the human world, which separated men from the holy world of angels, and so broke up the harmony of the divine spiritual creation. But yet more definitely the bringing back to Christ, termed, Col. i. 20, a reconciliation (*i.e.* removing entirely the split produced by sin),

[2] The ἀρχαί and δυνάμεις mentioned separately from one another, Rom. viii. 38, can scarcely, that is to say, be connected with this; in particular, the ἀρχαί as opposed to ἄγγελοι cannot be angel-powers (comp. footnote 1). Only 1 Thess. iv. 16 is mention made of an ἀρχάγγελος; and as the demoniac powers seem (1 Cor. xv. 24) to be separated into such orders, so, according to this analogy, the angels also are regarded as an organized kingdom. It may be, moreover, that the apostle has borrowed the names of these orders which occur in our Epistles from the Rabbinic schools (comp. even in Peter, § 50, *a*, footnote 2), or from the theosophic systems of his opponents; but in any case he does not attach the slightest importance to them, as in both the principal passages (Col. i. 16; Eph. i. 21) neither the order nor the names themselves agree. Besides the ἀρχαί and ἐξουσίαι, which occur also Col. ii. 10, Eph. iii. 10, they have only the κυριότητες in common, while in the passage in Colossians θρόνοι, and in that in the Ephesians δυνάμεις, appear as the fourth class. It is noteworthy that, Eph. iii. 15, mention is made of πατριαί (tribes, families) in heaven and earth, by which, therefore, the orders of angels are put under the idea of families. There can be no allusion, naturally, to bodily descent; in particular, the name πατριαί is borrowed from the fatherhood of God.

and which is there made expressly the world's goal, is referred to all that is upon the earth as well as in heaven.[3] The angels are also first brought back to their true position to His person (which was appointed to be the central point, and therewith the head of the spiritual creation), when He is raised above all orders of angels (Eph. i. 21), has become their head (Col. ii. 10), so that they now, the inhabitants of heaven, bend the knee to Him even as the inhabitants of earth and Hades (Phil. ii. 10). But while this relation of Christ to the angels serves only this purpose, to express the absoluteness of His universal rule (comp. § 19, *d*; § 50, *a*), the angels appear thereby to be included in the final goal of the redeeming work, because this last is nothing else than the goal of the world itself.

(*b*) In quite another sense the work of redemption has its bearing on the superhuman kingdom of evil, which similarly comes into greater prominence in our Epistles than in the earlier ones. The devil[4] is, according to Eph. ii. 2, the ruler,

[3] The εἰς αὐτόν, according to the whole context, can apply only to Christ, by which any reference to reconciliation with God is excluded. But then there is no difficulty in thinking of the heavenly beings, the good angels as such, who are only to be brought back to their normal position to Him. For while Christ was obliged, on account of man's sin, for the purpose of εἰρηνοποιῆσαι διὰ τοῦ αἵματος, to descend to their level in the rank of God's creatures (Phil. ii. 7, 8; comp. § 103, *c*), He had come into a relation to the angels thoroughly inadequate to His destination, and that could cease only after that He had finished the former, a matter which Gess, p. 245, overlooks. The subjugation of evil spirits (Schmidt, p. 193), or of the presumed angel of the law, Ritschl, ii. p. 251, cannot possibly be termed a bringing back to Him as the head; and the supposition of a class of angels, between the good and evil, needing redemption (Gess, p. 246; comp. also Schenkel, p. 283, footnote 3), is contrary to the Scriptures. A bringing back of the world of spirits hostile to God—which, moreover, is considered as definitely bad—is as far away from the biblical view as is also a need of redemption on the part of the angel world, and therefore the author felt no need to guard his expressions against both these thoughts. In the work of redemption the angels have no share, because they do not need it, and hence they appear, as with Peter (comp. § 50, *a*, footnote 2), and in a certain sense 1 Cor. xi. 10 (comp. footnote 1), only as spectators of it, when, according to Eph. iii. 10, the manifold wisdom of God is made known by means of the mystery of salvation realized in the Church (ver. 9), the wisdom which has brought about this goal.

[4] In the earlier Epistles the devil (Eph. iv. 27, vi. 11: ὁ διάβολος; ver. 16: ὁ πονηρός; comp. § 23, *a*, footnote 1; § 46, *d*, footnote 6; § 55, *b*), Satan, he who as the god of this world (2 Cor. iv. 4) rules the human world in bondage to sin, and inspires them with his spirit (1 Cor. ii. 12), as apparently he formerly misled Eve by means of the serpent (2 Cor. xi. 3), and with his daemons

according to whose law the heathen once walked, and whose spirit even now works in the children of disobedience, as it works also in the unconverted world by means of the spirits ruled by him (ἐξουσία in a collective sense).[5] If, therefore, God has stripped (ἀπεκδυσάμενος, Col. ii. 15) these powers of their weapons, and publicly exposed them (ἐδειγμάτισεν ἐν παῤῥησίᾳ), while He leads them out as vanquished in triumph on His cross (θριαμβεύσας αὐτοὺς ἐν αὐτῷ, *scil.* σταυρῷ), if He has therefore by the atoning death of Christ won a victory over them, then this, from its connection with ver. 14, where the removal of the relation of guilt is regarded (§ 100, *c*), can only be so understood, that man separated from God by guilt has thereby fallen under the dominion of the God-opposing power.[6] But this victory does not in principle prevent the devil with his powers of darkness continuing again to oppose the kingdom of Christ. All Christian life is a conflict

has his kingdom in heathenism (comp. § 70, *c*). The idea according to which bodily sufferings are traced back, as in Luke xiii. 16 (§ 23, *a*), to his activity is peculiar, yet so that he thus acts only with the express permission of Christ (2 Cor. xii. 7), or by the command of His apostles (1 Cor. v. 5). But the ὀλεθρευτής (1 Cor. x. 10) is an angel of God, who executes His judgments, not Satan or one of his angels. If, 2 Cor. xii. 7, mention is made of an ἄγγελος σατᾶν, it is clear that he is regarded as head of a kingdom of evil spirits, and he only with his angels can be meant as being, according to 1 Cor. vi. 3, subject to the judgment of believers. There is in this also, as in the heavenly world of spirits, various orders (1 Cor. xv. 24: πᾶσα ἀρχὴ καὶ πᾶσα ἐξουσία καὶ δύναμις) which have their power in the as yet unconverted world. With the conversion of heathenism and the deliverance of Israel comes accordingly the end of the history of salvation upon the earth, when all the powers hostile to God come to nought, and are subjected to Christ as their conqueror (ver. 25); comp. § 98, *a*.

[5] In Col. i. 13 they are called a power of darkness (in opposition to the ἄγγελοι τοῦ φωτός: 2 Cor. xi. 14), which keeps all men in bondage, according to Col. ii. 15. They are, Eph. vi. 12, regarded in their different orders (ἀρχαί, ἐξουσίαι), and in the latter passage they are designated according to their sphere of dominion as κοσμοκράτορες τοῦ σκότους τούτου, according to their nature as a fellowship of spirits full of evil (τὰ πνευματικὰ τῆς πονηρίας). If they are referred to as being ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις, that can be understood only in a popular sense, according to which all that is supermundane belongs to heaven, for their special dwelling-place is, according to Eph. ii. 2 (ἐξουσία τοῦ ἀέρος), the atmosphere between heaven and earth.

[6] Therewith the idea of Pfleiderer, p. 381 ff. [E. T. ii. 110], falls to the ground of itself, that here the role, which the wrath and the judgment of God play in the earlier system of Paul, is transferred to the devil and his angels, and hence reconciliation is subjectively applied from the other side. It is only the *dominion* of the God-opposing powers that is spoken of, as man can only then begin a new life in the service of God when freed from the consciousness of

against these superhuman and supermundane powers (Eph. vi. 12), in which the devil summons every means of cunning (ver. 11) and power (ver. 16) to bring about the fall of believers (ver. 13).[7] When one allows any sin whatever to master him, he gives way again to the devil (Eph. iv. 27). In conformity with the victory gotten in principle already, this contest must end in the final victory of Christ, who is able finally to subdue all things to Himself (Phil. iii. 21; comp. 1 Cor. xv. 24).[8]

(*c*) That Christ has brought about the reconciliation of sinful men with God, our Epistles teach in full agreement with the earlier (§ 100, *c*); but the steady use of the compound double *ἀποκαταλλάσσειν* (Col. i. 21; Eph. ii. 16) seems to point directly to the thought, that this reconciliation has but restored the original relation of humanity to God (comp. Col. i. 20). Even the closer relation into which God entered with Israel by the setting up of the theocracy is regarded as

guilt. Then only are Christians, according to i. 13, delivered from the power of darkness (comp. Acts xxvi. 18), so far as they are transplanted into the kingdom of Christ, *in which* they have deliverance from guilt (ver. 14), for which reason also, according to 1 Cor. v. 5, impenitent sinners are delivered over again to Satan. Ritschl, ii. p. 250, thinks here of the angel of the law. If, moreover, *ἡχμαλώτευσεν αἰχμαλωσίαν* (Eph. iv. 8) were also referred to this victory, these words from the Psalm would then be misapplied—if it were in any way indicated. Comp. Schmidt, p. 203.

[7] Even in the earlier Epistles, a fact which Pfleiderer, p. 458 [E. T. ii. 190], overlooks, Satan is the opposer of Christ and His saving work (2 Cor. vi. 15: *τίς συμφώνησις Χριστοῦ πρὸς Βελίαρ*). It is he who hinders the activity of the apostles (1 Thess. ii. 18), who blinds the minds of unbelievers (2 Cor. iv. 4), who tempts believers (1 Cor. vii. 5; comp. 1 Thess. iii. 5), and distresses them with cunning buffetings (2 Cor. ii. 11), and especially who tries (Rom. xvi. 20) by false teachers to destroy the efficacy of the gospel, while he clothes himself as an angel of light (2 Cor. xi. 14), and inspires false teachers with his spirit (2 Thess. ii. 2), on which account, on the appearance of those inspired by him, there is a constant need of the *διάκρισις πνευμάτων* (comp. § 92, *b*), and who finally will equip the last personification of the God-defying principle with his greatest power (2 Thess. ii. 9; comp. § 63, *c*).

[8] But this subjection, as little here as § 99, *c*, is regarded as a final conversion or annihilation of the kingdom of evil; for Eph. i. 10, Col. i. 20, according to note *α*, is spoken only of the heavenly powers in the narrowest sense, *i.e.* of the angels, since evil spirits and unbelievers, being incapable of final union to Christ, are, it is self-evident, left out of account (comp. footnote 3). But *καταχθόνιοι* (Phil. ii. 10) are not daemons, but the inhabitants of Hades. As to the final fate of those spirits, which according to 1 Cor. vi. 3 will be judged by believers, Paul has thrown as little light here as in his earlier Epistles. Enough that they by their subjection to Christ are stripped of any power which can hurt the absolute dominion of Christ.

one from which the heathen got separated only by their God-opposing development (Eph. ii. 12); but it was originally intended for them. With this it would agree that God, iii. 15, from whom every *πατριά* in heaven and earth is named, is regarded as standing originally in paternal relationship to all men and angels; and this is but restored by the adoption of Christians (§ 100, *d*). On the other hand, men originally have shared in the divine life; for the religious darkening of heathenism, the result of their own guilt, has not only, as in the earlier Epistles, occasioned a deep moral degradation, but also a separation from the divine life (originally possessed)[9] (iv. 18: *ἀπηλλοτριωμένοι τῆς ζωῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ*). But the newness of life recovered in Christianity, which in the earlier Epistles is a creation of God's (comp. § 84, *d*), appears here also, concretely considered, as a new man created by God (*ὁ καινὸς ἄνθρωπος*: Eph. ii. 15), in contrast to the old (iv. 22; Col. iii. 9; comp. yet Rom. vi. 6); but it is peculiar to our Epistles that the ideal realized in this renewal is designated the image of God (iv. 10: *κατ' εἰκόνα τοῦ κτίσαντος*; comp. Eph. iv. 24: *κατὰ Θεὸν κτισθείς*).[10] In reality, nothing else is hereby meant but the divine life lost by sinful depravity (ver. 18), so that the work of salvation here also restores only the originally God-related nature of man.

(*d*) With the restoration of the original relation to God is

[9] The correlation of light and life seems to be different in the passage Phil. ii. 15, 16, where the *ζωή* is eternal life (§ 101, *c*; 102, *c*). The earlier Epistles also acknowledge the designation of the sinful life as a state of death (Rom. vii. 10, 24, and therewith § 72, *b*); but here the moral condition of heathenism is expressly designated a being dead through sin (Eph. ii. 1, 5; comp. v. 4) or in sin (Col. ii. 13). Closely connected with this, by a peculiar turn of the image, the idea of a resurrection with Christ is opposed not to a dying with Christ, but to this former state of death (Col. ii. 12, 13, iii. 1; Eph. ii. 5, 6).

[10] We can only be doubtful whether one is thereby explicitly to think of the innate divine image (Gen. i. 27), as Baur, p. 271, supposes, since this, at least in the earlier Epistles, refers only to the lordly dignity of man (1 Cor. xi. 7; comp. § 94, *c*). But the old man must, according to a figure very frequent with Paul, be put off as a garment that the new man may be put on (*ἐνδύεσθαι*: 1 Thess. v. 8; Gal. iii. 27; 1 Cor. xv. 53, 54; Rom. xiii. 12, 14; Col. ii. 11, iii. 12; Eph. vi. 11, 14). Without a figure, it is meant that the new man, which has thus just taken the place of the old, as the old nature ever intrudes again into the new nature, which has been introduced in principle at least to disturb it, is constantly being renewed, *i.e.* in its new qualities, which it as the *νέος ἄνθρωπος* bears, and must be restored (Col. iii. 10: *ἐνδυσάμενοι τὸν νέον τὸν ἀνακαινούμενον*; comp. 2 Cor. iv. 16; Rom. xii. 2).

removed also the separation which sin had occasioned between men and God. This representation of the doctrine of the atonement is, to be sure, familiar in the earlier Epistles; but it has in our Epistles, for the first time, the peculiar form, that we have access to God through Christ (Eph. ii. 18, iii. 12; comp. § 100, *d*). The removal thereby of the opposition that had arisen between the heavenly and the earthly worlds is no doubt in our Epistles specially emphasized; while the representation of a fellowship of life with Christ, as He sits at the right hand of God in heaven (*ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις*: Col. iii. 1; Eph. i. 20), is followed out even to the bold expression, that God has made those made alive in Christ to sit with Him (*συνεκάθισεν*) in heaven, so far as they are *ἐν Χριστῷ* (Eph. ii. 6).[11] But not only are the good things presently given him with Christ there, but those also certain to him in hope (Col. i. 5: *ἡ ἐλπὶς ἡ ἀποκειμένη ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς*),—above all, the life looked for in the future world, the life which, as appointed for him by God, but yet, no doubt, hid in God, is even now really existing there, as also the glorified body which Christ has already obtained, and which is now only hid for us to become manifest at the Parousia at the same time with what has been appointed for us (iii. 3, 4; comp., moreover, 2 Cor. v. 1). If the inheritance also (*κλῆρος*; comp. Acts xxvi. 18) appointed for the saints is in the kingdom of light (*ἐν φωτί*; comp. 2 Cor. xi. 14: *ἄγγελος φωτός*), that future world, so are they being prepared by God for their portion therein (*μερίς*; comp. 2 Cor. vi. 15); so that they, also on that account, may certainly ideally be regarded as

[11] But there is by no means laid "less stress on the transcendence of the final consummation, and more on the immanence of the present Christian consciousness of salvation," going beyond the Epistles to the Philippians and Colossians (Pfleiderer, p. 451 [E. T. ii. 183]). For, according even to Col. i. 13, those delivered from the power of darkness are transplanted into the kingdom of Christ, as He sits at the right hand of God (iii. 1); their citizenship (*πολίτευμα*) is in heaven, where Christ their Lord is (Phil. iii. 20). He who is dead with Christ is no more one *ζῶν ἐν κόσμῳ* (Col. ii. 20), he is in general one dead to this earth (iii. 3); all his efforts and thoughts are directed to *τὰ ἄνω* (vv. 1, 2), not to *τὰ ἐπίγεια* (Phil. iii. 19). Only what is yet sinful in him belongs to the earth; and hence, Col. iii. 5, the sinful inclinations still clinging to him are designated his earthly members (*τὰ μέλη ὑμῶν τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς*), while that part of his being which is directed to heavenly things is regarded as in heaven with Christ. And hence the Christian life is here throughout characterized as a heavenly life.

citizens of that kingdom of light. We have here only a higher degree of that intermingling of the present and the future we have already met with, § 96, *b*, in the earlier Epistles.

§ 105. *The Realization of Salvation in the Church.*

Through the very intimate union of the Church with Christ as her Head, the Church is led on to her consummation—with that consummation the goal of the world is reached (*a*). But this realization of salvation becomes actual in the Church when thereby the rent between Gentiles and Jews is removed, and the former share in this salvation promised them in Christ (*b*). The partition-wall, in particular, which the law had set up between them, is broken down; while by this removal an entirely new rule for life and worship is set up for both parties through Christ (*c*). Yet the law, according to its real meaning, is fulfilled in Christianity, because, inasmuch as it must yield to this new law, it typically pointed to it (*d*).

(*a*) The ultimate end of the world appointed by God, which is to be reached by the execution of the eternal purpose of redemption, has begun to be realized in the Church,[1] in so far as Christ has been given her by God as Head (Eph. i. 22). His position as supreme head (*ὑπὲρ πάντα*) has been not only thereby indicated, but the idea already hinted at, 1 Cor. xii. 27, of an organic oneness of the Church united with Christ has here become a favourite expression for the nature of the Church herself, so far as the relation to Christ aimed at in the plan of the world and of salvation is realized in her.' Christ is the head (Eph. iv. 15), the Church is His body (ver. 12; Col. i. 24); both are, as the head and the body, inseparably united (ver. 18).[2] And not only does the Church, as the body, stand

[1] In our Epistles *ἐκκλησία* occurs most frequently for the whole community, *i.e.* the Church; but it is also used for local churches (Col. iv. 16; Phil. iv. 15), and for single meetings within these (Col. iv. 15; Philem. 2), quite as § 92, *a*, footnote 1. The individual members of the Church stand, moreover, in a fellowship of life with Christ, in virtue of which He is in them and they in Him (§ 101, *a*); and thus, on that account, all things begin to be gathered together in Christ in the Church, and the end of the world to be realized, according to Eph. i. 10.

[2] Now, inasmuch as, according to § 94, *c*, the man is the woman's head (to be sure, as her lord chiefly), marriage is presented as the earthly type of this relation (Eph. v. 23),—in it the woman is subject to the man (ver. 24). At the

in need of Christ, as the head (ii. 19; Eph. iv. 15, 16), but the apostle ventures the bold expression, that Christ also needs the Church, as the body, as that which belongs to His completeness, makes His being just quite complete (i. 23: *τὸ πλήρωμα αὐτοῦ*). For although the apostle no doubt expressly adds that it is He who fills the whole universe with His universal Lordship, yet He can do this only by this union with the Church, to which He had been appointed in the world's plan (§ 103, *b*). As the body of Christ, the Church must increase. This increase, wrought by God (*αὔξησις τοῦ Θεοῦ*), proceeds organically from the head, and is mediated by the various joints and bands which connect the body with the head, and convey to us the vital powers of the head (Col. ii. 19), *i.e.* by the different helpful agencies of Christ, by which He, according to the activity corresponding to the measure of the gifts of grace each member has received, promotes the increase of the Church (Eph. iv. 16), that she may increasingly become in all parts what she ought to be as the body corresponding to the head (ver. 15), that she may reach the stature of a mature man, may become an *ἀνὴρ τέλειος* (ver. 13). This manhood (*ἡλικία τοῦ πληρώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ*) is that state in which, through the perfecting her relation to Christ, who now communicates Himself entirely to her, the Church is herself filled with the whole fulness of Christ; and because in Him dwells all the fulness of Godhead, she is herself filled up to the measure of all the fulness of God (iii. 19; comp. § 103, *d*).[3] But thereby, at the same time, is perfected her

same time the relation of the Church to Christ is a relation of love (vi. 24; comp. 1 Cor. xvi. 22). But as the man lives in the wife, who is but a part of his very self (vv. 28, 29), so Christ lives in the Church, the members of His own body, which, ver. 30, are perhaps so designated as having grown out from Him (comp. 1 Cor. xi. 12). Marriage thus comes to be a prophecy full of mystery (comp. § 73, *d*) of the relation of Christ to His body, inasmuch as He, like as the man left father and mother to be joined to his wife (Gen. ii. 24), once left heaven in order perfectly to realize His marriage union with the Church (vv. 31, 32), which He is even now preparing for Himself as His bride, while He seeks to lead her on to ever spotless holiness (ver. 27; comp. 2 Cor. xi. 2). So little does there lie in ver. 31 ff. any reference to the coming of Christ into the world, as little can one, with Pfleiderer, p. 490 [E. T. ii. 222], seek a polemic against Docetism, which he drags in only by an impossible interpretation, p. 432 [E. T. ii. 163], in iv. 20 ff. (comp. on the other hand, § 102, *d*).

[3] It is certainly a mistake when Gess, p. 270, thinks that in *ἡλικία τοῦ πληρώματος* the reference is to the manhood of Christ Himself, so that the indwelling

relation to God, who is over all her members, works by all of them, and lives in all of them (iv. 6); and thereby is the goal of the world reached, in which God is to be all in all (1 Cor. xv. 28).[4]

(*b*) While, now, the Church realizes herself in the midst of the *κόσμος*, she finds pre-Christian humanity separated by the profound religious-historical contrast of Judaism and heathenism. But the work of redemption, which has removed the rent between men and the higher world of spirits, as also that between earth and heaven (§ 104), is shown here also as the removal of all existing contrasts. Christ has become the peacemaker (Eph. ii. 14: *ἡ εἰρήνη ἡμῶν*), when He came and proclaimed an equal salvation to the near and the far off (Isa. lvii. 19), *i.e.* to Jew and Gentile (ver. 17). But the union of the two has, in the first place, been brought about in this way, that the heathen had obtained a share in the promise to Israel,—that they have become *συγκληρονόμα καὶ σύσσωμα καὶ συμμέτοχα τῆς ἐπαγγελίας*, and this in Christ, in whose redeeming work they share by the preaching of the word working faith in them (iii. 6). This promise was originally the distinction of Israel, by which the Israelites, as those whose hope rested specially upon the Messiah (i. 12: *προηλπικότας ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ*), stood in a relation, even though one as yet only ideal, to Him in whom the Church was to obtain her head, and to be led on to the realization of God's saving plan. They were therefore, according to the counsel of Him who

of the *πλήρωμα* was perfected in Him gradually. Bold but touching is the reference to the age in which the Church becomes perfect, as she is to be according to Eph. i. 23 (Pfleiderer, p. 442 [E. T. ii. 173]), where Pfleiderer holds fast to the only correct explanation, which has been abandoned by Gess, p. 258, from reasons which are set aside by the former analysis of the passage. But it is inconceivable how he can found on this a difference between the Epistles to the Colossians and Ephesians, that what in the one is regarded as concluded in Christ, is to be realized in the other by the growth and increase of the Church. Here the Christology is emphasized as against the false teachers; in the other the practical consequences for the Church are drawn out, without the Christological idea being thereby regarded a "still imperfect abstraction."

[4] The more Paul, according to § 99, c, had once hoped that this goal in humanity would be reached completely, all the more do we understand how, later, when he became conscious of restraints on his missionary activity, he could think only with tears on those who remained enemies to the cross of Christ, and thereby shut themselves out from this goal (Phil. iii. 18, and with this Weiss, *Philipperbrief*, 1859, p. 276).

works all things according to the counsel of His will, predestinated to that to which they had attained as their appointed portion (ver. 11: ἐκληρώθημεν); while the heathen, who stood in no relation to Messiah, because they, being far off from the theocracy of Israel and the covenants of promise, had no God and no hope (ii. 12), hear for the first time in the gospel of the existing deliverance, and having received it in faith, receive also through the promised Spirit the earnest of the complete salvation guaranteed in it (i. 13, 14). And thus those who were once foreigners, and had no right of citizenship in the theocracy, become now, according to ii. 19, fellow-citizens with the saints (comp. Rom. xi. 16), and members of God's household, whose *familia* is made up of the children of the patriarchs (comp. ii. 13: οἵ ποτε ὄντες μακρὰν ἐγγὺς ἐγενήθητε).[5] But if it is suggested by the ἀπελλοτριωμένοι (ii. 12) that even the Gentiles, though they have never belonged to the theocracy, were yet originally destined to participate in it (§ 104, *c*), then the union of Gentiles and Jews in the Church but realizes the divine plan of the world, which appointed the whole of humanity to be united in Christ, even though this union was only promised to Israel, and prepared beforehand in Israel.

(*c*) The complete union of heathens with Jews does not depend only on this, that the former share now in what the latter formerly enjoyed, but also in this, that that has been taken away which had formerly prevented fellowship between them, and which was the enmity which, like a dividing wall, kept the two portions of pre-Christian humanity apart, and which was originated and ever would be afresh by the hedge of the law shutting up the Jews under a painful rule of life hateful to the heathen, and denying them free intercourse with the nations (Eph. ii. 14: τὸ μεσότοιχον τοῦ φραγμοῦ). But now Christ has abolished the law of commandments consisting in

[5] All this corresponds perfectly to the statements of the earlier Epistles, explained § 90, *c*, since, ver. 11, the election of Israel is not to be referred to the κλῆρος θεοῦ (comp. Pfleiderer, p. 438 [E. T. ii. 169]), which, though often supplied, did not then exist, but the obtainment of the saving blessing (κλῆρος) promised to them; and ii. 17 does not refer to the preaching through the Spirit (Pfleiderer, p. 445 [E. T. ii. 176]), but to the earthly preaching of Christ, which brought a salvation bound to no national privileges, and hence destined for those that are far off as for those that are near.

ordinances (δόγματα) in His flesh (ver. 15).[6] And so along with the root of the enmity, He has taken away at the same time the enmity itself (ver. 16: ἀποκτείνας τὴν ἔχθραν ἐν αὐτῷ, *scil.* τῷ σταυρῷ). But with the abolition of the law the dividing wall between Gentiles and Jews has been taken away, and nothing now prevents the complete union of the two. So long as the law was in force, the Jews were bound to a different rule of life than the Gentiles; but both now are made one new man in the fellowship of life with Christ (ver. 15); they have but one rule of life in which every difference which separated pre-Christian humanity falls away, because Christ is all and in all (comp. Col. iii. 11). The law gave to the Jews a law appointed for them to attain reconciliation with God by means of its institution of sacrifice; both are now united in one σῶμα, and in this union are reconciled to God in the same way (namely, by the cross) (ver. 16; comp. Col. i. 21, 22); both have access to God through Christ in one spirit (ver. 18). But in order to bring about this unity of the new rule of life and of sacrifice, Christ has to remove the old rule of the law by His death (ver. 15: ἵνα).[7]

[6] This, from its connection with vv. 13, 16, can only be so understood that Christ, while He gave His flesh to the bloody death of the cross, so founded the new ordinance of salvation, and set aside the old ordinance of the law. And this is confirmed by Col. ii. 14, by which, at the same time that God blotted out the handwriting of the law condemning us, He at the same time took the law even itself (καὶ αὐτό), which by its (unfulfilled and unfulfillable) commandments ever stood against us as an enemy, out of the way, while He nailed it to the cross, *i.e.* publicly proclaimed it as set aside by the death on the cross (comp. § 100, *c*, footnote 9). This leads on, no doubt, to the thought in Rom. x. 4 (comp. § 87, *a*, footnote 1), but our Epistles evidently see in this the setting aside of the law of commandments generally. If the earlier Epistles bring this about subjectively for the individual by his being dead with Christ, this view is to be found, Col. ii. 20, in our Epistles, and even the earlier Epistles speak quite objectively of the transitory character of the law (§ 72, *c*). In particular, the characterizing of the law, moreover, by its δόγματα, quite reminds one of the substitution of γράμμα by πνεῦμα in the older Epistles.

[7] It is therefore unjustifiable when Pfleiderer, p. 448 [E. T. ii. 179], finds here a confusion of different thoughts, which he traces back to the combination of the passage in the Epistle to the Colossians with the new thoughts of the author. The only peculiarity of our Epistle is that the abolition of the law is no longer pressed by way of argument against a righteousness by law, or the unauthorized demands of the Jewish rule of life. The contrast between the righteousness of God gotten by faith and one's own righteousness through the law (Phil. iii. 9), only illustrates the nature of the Christian life, which finds

(*d*) The more that the stress of Jewish opposition to the missionary sphere of Paul was broken in the later period of his life, the more in his mixed churches had the power of the Christian spirit and the need of organizing a new common rule of life set the Jewish Christians gradually free in a more comprehensive manner from the customs of their fathers, as Paul himself had in principle from the first urged (comp. § 87, *b*), the more easily does the altered position to the law become evident, which our Epistles show. For the more that the law lost its significance in its literal form even for the Jewish Christians, all the more had Paul to seek elsewhere a reason for abiding significance suitable to it as the divine law; and for this the typical interpretation presents itself, of which, moreover, there are hints in the earlier Epistles (comp. § 73, *c*). According to this interpretation, as it is in principle formulated, Col. ii. 17, the legal institutions are but the *σκιὰ τῶν μελλόντων*, *i.e.* the shadowy patterns of the institutions of the Messianic age; they picture, to be sure, their outer form, but do not contain their essence. The body itself, *i.e.* the concrete realization of them, belongs to Christ (*τὸ δὲ σῶμα Χριστοῦ*), inasmuch as He is their author and imposes them. His atoning sacrifice, given of His free will, is the real atoning sacrifice acceptable to God (Eph. v. 2); the circumcision wrought by Him, which consists in the putting off in baptism of the *σῶμα*, ruled by the *σάρξ*, completed in the fellowship of His life, is the true circumcision not made with hands (Col. ii. 11). Christians are therefore those really circumcised; their *λατρεία*, wrought by the Spirit of God, is the true service of God (Phil. iii. 3; comp. Rom. xii. 1), and the exercise of Christian love (iv. 18) and the discharge of the apostolic office (ii. 17; comp. Rom. xv. 16) are the real sacrifices. In this way the law in its deepest sense is fulfilled in Christianity, so far as its ordinances image in a shadowy way the nature of the law of Christian life; and it is self-evident that its commandments continue regulative in Christianity,

its chief good in the Lord, as the ground of all confidence and of all joy. The polemic against giving value to abstinence from meats and drinks, or the observance of particular feast-days (Col. ii. 16), comes in only from the point of view of dependence on ordinances, as these in general belong to the immature stage of the religious development of pre-Christian times (ver. 20; comp. moreover, Gal. iv. 3, 9).

where they directly reveal God's will regarding the natural relationships of life (Eph. vi. 2; § 101, *b*).[8]

§ 106. *Christianity as the Principle of Fellowship.*

It is the task of the Church to realize ever more completely by unanimity the oneness objectively given to her, a oneness which is not destroyed by the variety of her gifts, which have in view the one goal of real perfection (*a*). But this can only be fulfilled by an unselfish and humble love, which by meekness and long-suffering, as also by kind and yielding gentleness, renders all contention impossible (*b*). Instead of unprofitable asceticism is to come not only abstinence from heathenish lusts, but also from such words as disturb the fellowship of love; and, in general, social intercourse is to be consecrated even in word to the service of love and the praise of God (*c*). More especially those natural duties, which the fundamental forms of human social life require, are to be fulfilled in Christianity to the fullest extent (*d*).

(*a*) On the removal of the opposition between Jew and Gentile, the Church becomes conscious only in an original way of what her task is, namely, to realize unanimity (εἰρήνη), and thus to be in her sphere what Christ in a more comprehensive sense is for the whole universe. On that very account is she one body, in this organic unity is already

[8] It is a mistake when Baur, p. 275 ff., supposes that Judaism and Christianity are drawn more closely together in our Epistles than in the earlier ones. By the special emphasizing of the principle of the typical character of the Old Testament institutions, the significance which these have in themselves is rather evidently put in the background. In the earlier Epistles the significance is strongly maintained which circumcision as such had (§ 71, *a*); here, where the typical significance of circumcision seems to be fulfilled in baptism (Col. ii. 11, 12), the circumcision made with hands in the flesh is designated as a λιγομένη, *i.e.* as something not real (Eph. ii. 11; comp. Pfleiderer, p. 436 [E. T. ii. 167]); it is even a κατατομή (Phil. iii. 3), a mutilation without a purpose (comp. Gal. v. 12). Circumcision has lost any significance in itself, since it has been fulfilled in a typical sense. What Paul has said in the earlier Epistles, therefore, of the original significance of circumcision, is not taken away, but attention to that is put purposely in the background. In the foreground of his Christian consciousness is put the view, that everything of real good which Judaism possessed must now be regarded by him as not only useless, but hurtful, in so far as it is a hindrance to seek and find in Christ the highest good; it must even be regarded as folly (Phil. iii. 7, 8). To Judaism abiding in unbelief, all its holy institutions, as all its blessings, have become perverted into worthless, even hurtful possessions.

intimated her calling for the realization of εἰρήνη (Col. iii. 15: εἰς ἣν ἐκλήθετε ἐν ἑνὶ σώματι). To the ἓν σῶμα there also corresponds the ἓν πνεῦμα (Eph. iv. 4), the one Spirit, which is given to the Church by Christ, and assures her of the common saving blessings (vv. 5, 6).[1] But the Christian hope established in the Church is proclaimed to her in the gospel (Col. i. 5), and stress was laid on the universal character of the gospel at a time when alien speculations would press into the Church and endanger her unity (§ 59, *c*). But this unity of the gospel is also guaranteed in this way, that it is the same instruments called of God and endowed with His Spirit (Eph. iii. 5: οἱ ἅγιοι ἀπόστολοι καὶ προφῆται) which proclaim it. On the foundation laid and established by them, of which Christ is the corner-stone, as He forms the central point in the proclamation of salvation, is each community, and therewith each Church, built up into the one temple of God (comp. § 92, *a*), in which God in Christ or in His Spirit dwells (ii. 20–22).[2] To this unity of the Church objectively

[1] As the Spirit is the earnest of the one hope (§ 101, *c*), each member is so added to the Church, that one and the same hope is quickened in him at the same time in this calling (καθὼς καὶ ἐκλήθητε ἐν μιᾷ ἐλπίδι τῆς κλήσεως ὑμῶν). But the oneness of the hope rests again on the oneness of Christ as κύριος, as also of faith on Him, and of baptism into Him by which the calling is subjectively and objectively perfected (ver. 5); and on the oneness of God as the Father of all believers, in whom their relation to God, intended in the plan of the world and of redemption, is realized in their fellowship with Christ (ver. 6; comp. § 105, *a*). But the unity of the Spirit can be preserved only if the Church, kept firmly bound together by the bond of unanimity, resists (Eph. iv. 3) the entrance and influence of every other (devilish) spirit; she can only stand fast in the one spirit, if she contends with one heart for the faith in the gospel (Phil. i. 27), and looks with one heart at the one goal (ii. 2: σύμψυχοι τὸ ἓν φρονοῦντες), which is presented in the hope set before her.

[2] To regard the apostles and prophets as themselves the foundation, in opposition to 1 Cor. iii. 11 (Pfleiderer, p. 446 [E. T. ii. 178]; Immer, p. 377), is therefore irreconcilable with the designation of Christ as the corner-stone, because the Epistle to the Ephesians could least so co-ordinate the head of the Church with its members (even the most important of them). To be sure, in the earlier Epistles it is the apostolic activity in the founding of churches which is alone presented (§ 89, *c*); but here it is their upbuilding (ἐποικοδομεῖν) which is specially treated of, wherein even in 1 Cor. iii. 10–14 the fellow-labourers of the apostle are also noticed, but only in so far as this ensues by the preserving and conforming of the foundation laid by the apostles, it is called at the same time the foundation of the prophets. These particularly are noticed on this account, because in our Epistles the contents of the Epistles are regarded essentially as the mystery made known (§ 102, *c*) through divine revelation; and

considered the manifoldness of the gifts of grace stands in no contradiction, by which grace is given to each individual member of the Church according to the measure of the gift of Christ (iv. 7; comp. ver. 16).[3] Along with apostles and prophets, who are even in the earlier Epistles the first and the most eminent possessors of gifts, appear, ver. 11, also evangelists, who, though not by name, yet really occurred before (§ 89, *c*), pastors and teachers,[4] and, as possessors of the gift of government and of service (§ 92, *d*), the *ἐπίσκοποι καὶ διάκονοι* (Phil. i. 1). But, however manifold these gifts might be, they had yet all but one object, to fit saints for the work of the ministration, which each had to discharge for the development of the Church (Eph. iv. 12, 16).[5]

the prophets, like the apostles, speak (Eph. iii. 4, 5) *κατ' ἀποκάλυψιν* (§ 92, *b*, footnote 8). But there is presented no reason to find in this, with Pfleiderer, a placing of the Spirit as an independent principle of truth on a footing of equality with Christ, and to see in it a strengthening of the Church consciousness.

[3] If, in contrast with § 92, *b*, footnote 7, Christ is here expressly designated as He who, after His ascension, has given gifts to men (vv. 8–10), with that has to be connected the thought that from Him, as the head of the Church, everything proceeds which helps to the increase of His body.

[4] By the current supposition that here two distinct possessors of gifts are united with the three others, it is yet not clear that the gifts of government and teaching occurring separately in the earlier Epistles were already wont to be united in the same persons, since the possessors of gifts belonging to single churches might also be put in contrast to those serving the whole Church. But it is by no means without more ado established that the figure of a shepherd, following the example of Peter (§ 47, *a*, footnote 1), is to be referred to the office of the bishop, as Acts xx. 28 cannot be regulative for the use of the word by the apostle (comp. on the other hand, Phil. i. 1), and the figure may refer to the feeding the Church with the word of truth, and may be but a figurative term for teacher. But that the words, Eph. iv., refer chiefly and perhaps exclusively to gifts of teaching, gives likewise no ground for holding that in our Epistles the main stress lies on the advancement of knowledge (§ 102, *c*).

[5] If this is designated an *οἰκοδομή* from the point of view of the human partnership in it, there is also implied the image of a temple of God (Eph. ii. 20–22), just as in § 92, *b*; while, according to § 105, *a*, from the point of view of the help given by Christ (as the Head), the growth of the body is suggested. It is peculiar that in our Epistles both images have come to be, for the apostle, so much *termini technici*, whose figurativeness is hardly felt by him, that he mixes them up one with another in many ways (ii. 21, iv. 12, 16). The uniform end of this development is, however, the *τελειότης*, which is more closely defined, ver. 13, as the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of Christ (§ 102, *c*), in contrast to the spiritual unripeness, which is blown about by any wind of doctrine in the misleading deceit of human wisdom (ver. 14); and, Col. i. 28, as the manhood (comp. iv. 12) in fellowship of

(*b*) The Church can reach her goal only when she ever more completely realizes her true being in unanimity, and this takes place by love. The uniform striving of all towards one goal can be realized only when all are animated by the spirit of similar love, have the same love (Phil. ii. 2). Only when all Christian virtues are perfected and bound together into a unity by love as the one bond of perfection, can unanimity rule in the heart (Col. iii. 14, 15; comp. Eph. iv. 2, 3; Phil. iv. 2). And hence love is that in which hearts are united (Col. ii. 2), forming the element of life in which each healthy growth of the body of Christ is effected (Eph. iii. 18, iv. 15). Even in the earlier Epistles love is the cardinal Christian virtue (§ 93, *b*), and here from this point of view its significance as such is more accurately established.[6] But the love which is alone capable of sustaining unanimity is, according to Phil. ii. 3, 4, an unselfish love, which seeks not its own (comp. 1 Cor. xiii. 5, x. 24), and therefore forms the contrast to all selfish party striving (ἐριθεία),—a humble love also, which, far from vain ambition, readily and willingly subjects self to another (comp. Eph. v. 21). And thus here, as in the earlier Epistles (§ 93, *a*), humility is connected with love (iv. 2; Col. iii. 12),—a humility which in both passages is associated with a meekness which is not easily provoked (comp. Eph. iv. 26; Col. iii. 8), and with a long-suffering which bears patiently with the weakness or the wrongs of others, and thus passes over again to love (Eph. iv. 2: ἀνεχόμενοι ἀλλήλων ἐν ἀγάπῃ; comp. Col. iii. 12, 13), with which we formerly found both united. Here also, as formerly, the love of which Christ Himself, Eph.

life with Christ, which is reached by right practical instruction, in contrast to the perverse method in which a higher perfection of Christian life was striven after at Colosse. To this perfection no one is ever to believe that he has already attained (Phil. iii. 12–14); rather ought he, according to the beautiful oxymoron of the apostle, to seek perfection in this way, never imagining himself perfect, but always striving after perfection (iii. 15; comp. § 26, *d*).

[6] Love is the special fruit of righteousness (Phil. i. 11), the result of Christ dwelling in our hearts (Eph. iii. 17, 18); for it inquiries are first made (Col. i. 8; Philem. 5), it is first prayed for (Phil. i. 9), exhortations to it before everything else are made (Eph. v. 2). If it appears (as § 62, *b*) to be co-ordinated with faith, Eph. i. 15, Col. i. 4 (when as love to all the saints, it depends on the hope common to them, ver. 5), and perhaps Philem. 5, this happens only when inquiries are made after principal points in which the position of the Church shows it deserving of praise; but Eph. vi. 23 proves that there can be no actual co-ordination by which faith would become a virtue alongside of love.

v. 2, is set forth as a pattern, is a love which kindly gives (iv. 32: χρηστοὶ, εὔσπλαγχνοι; Col. iii. 12: σπλάγχνα οἰκτιρμοῦ χρηστότης), as it is a love which meekly forgives, after the pattern of God (ver. 13; Eph. iv. 32, v. 1); and this, Phil. iv. 5, is comprehended in the idea of considerate and condescending forbearance (ἐπιεικές, comp. 2 Cor. x. 1), which yields in every quarrel, and ends it.

(*c*) The more our Epistles combat a tendency to place the essence of Christian morality in an unfruitful, pretentious (Col. ii. 23) asceticism (§ 59, *c*), in which Paul could see only a relapse into the στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου (ver. 20), the more would it be necessary to show how Christian morality had to busy itself with the relationships of the natural life. Hence those ever repeated emphatic hints thereto, how moral purity and spotlessness is the goal of Christianity (Col. i. 22; Eph. i. 4, v. 27; Phil. i. 10, ii. 15; comp. iv. 8, 9), with which, here especially, is given abstinence from the cardinal heathen lusts of unchastity and covetousness (Col. iii. 5; Eph. v. 3, 5; comp. § 100, *b*).[7] It is, however, social intercourse whose consecration the exhortations of our Epistles have in view. It is not only sinful wrath against which Paul utters a warning, but even against the outbreak of that wrath in clamour and reviling (Col. iii. 8; Eph. iv. 31); above all, he forbids lying (Col. iii. 9), as that destroys that fellowship of Christians one with another, suitable to fellow-members (demanding as it does confidence, and therefore veracity) (Eph. iv. 25), and without which the idea of the Church cannot be realized[8] (note *a*). But a yet greater emphasis is laid on the significance of speech in social intercourse. It ought always to be with circumspection, to give one's neighbour

[7] Paul specially warns against participation in heathen conviviality, in which one cannot give way without gluttony (Eph. v. 18) and unchastity (comp. Rom. xiii. 13), and which ever again drew into fellowship with heathenish sin (v. 7, 11); and he sets the command to work over against the prohibition from stealing, as the former seeks to gain not only support for one's own self, but also the means of doing good (iv. 28).

[8] He asks practical wisdom in intercourse with those who are not Christians, a wisdom which redeems the right opportunity, is always ready to give the right answer with conciliatory words (Col. iv. 5, 6), and uses every moment to exercise a bettering influence on them (Eph. v. 11–16). Christian morality is at the same time characterized (Phil. iv. 8) as that which is lovable and praiseworthy, and has a good report among men (comp. § 47, *d*).

an evidence of love by an upbuilding corresponding to his need, in contrast to corrupt (Eph. iv. 29), empty, frivolous, or even obscene talk (Col. iii. 8 : *αἰσχρολογία* ; comp. Eph. v. 4). The highest aim of social intercourse is to make room for the word of Christ in society, for mutual teaching and instruction, as also for edification by the very manifold forms of praise (Col. iii. 16 ; Eph. v. 19). That is connected with the very special emphasis which is put on the duty of thanksgiving (Col. i. 12, ii. 7, iii. 15, 17, iv. 2 ; Eph. v. 4, 20 ; Phil. iv. 6 ; comp. Col. i. 3 ; Philem. 4 ; Eph. i. 16 ; Phil. i. 3), by which accordingly the blessed fellowship must serve the final end of the work of salvation, the glorification of God as in § 99, *d* (Eph. i. 6, 12, 14, iii. 21 ; Phil. i. 11, ii. 11, iv. 20).[9]

(*d*) The more that Christianity is regarded as the principle of fellowship, the more must the transforming influence be emphasized which it exerts upon the forms of natural social life. The family is the fundamental form of such life, and hence in our Epistles the apostle takes up in such special detail the relations of family life, and develops quite systematically the moral duties, which spring up from a Christian point of view for the individual members of the family. Accordingly, we are not to look for discussions of the principles relating to marriage, which we met with in the earlier Epistles, § 95. The fact of Christian marriage is presupposed, and therefore all that is treated of is, what are the duties this lays upon husbands and wives? But these can be no other than such as are essentially already implied in the nature of this social relationship appointed by God, because Christianity cannot abolish, it can only sanctify that relationship.[10] But

[9] With this are connected the exhortations to prayer and watchfulness (Col. iv. 2 ; Eph. vi. 18 ; Phil. iv. 6 ; comp. 1 Cor. xvi. 13 : *γρηγορῖτε*, and § 62, *b*), and specially to intercession (Col. iv. 3 ; Eph. vi. 18, 19 ; Phil. i. 19), which the blessed fellowship places in the service of love, and in which the apostle himself gives the pattern (Col. i. 3, 9, ii. 1 ; Eph. i. 16 ff., iii. 14 ff. ; Phil. i. 9 ; comp. Col. iv. 12). Comp. § 93, *b*.

[10] Even in the Christian state the fundamental duty of the wife is subjection (Col. iii. 18), and the reverential fear which springs from that (Eph. v. 33). This springs directly from the position of the natural subjection of the wife (§ 94, *c*), and is even traced back to that (vv. 22, 23). Just so the duty of love towards the wife on the part of the man results (Col. iii. 19) from this, that marriage is essentially the fleshly fellowship of the sexes (Eph. v. 31) ; the man loves in his wife only a part of himself (v. 28, 29, 33).

while the Christian now acknowledges that marriage is a mystery, which points to the relation of Christ and His Church (ver. 32; comp. § 105, *a*, footnote 2), Christ is the pattern of the love the man owes to the wife (vv. 25, 29), the Church in her subjection to Christ the pattern of the duty of the wife (ver. 24). It is hence clear that this subjection of the wife in marriage is the will of Christ, that she obey her own Christian husband (ver. 22). In the relation of children to their father, the same absolute obedience continues in the Christian state (Col. iii. 29; Eph. vi. 1: ὑπακούετε . . . ἐν κυρίῳ) which the divine commandment required in the Old Testament (ver. 2). If, on the other hand, the parental duty is therein defined, not to provoke children to resistance, there is to this, in the first place, a caution added, that the trustfulness which forms the basis of the natural relation of children is not to be endangered by discouragement (Col. iii. 21); but reference is here, Eph. vi. 4, expressly made to this, that it contradicts the nature of Christian nurture, in which the Lord would lead and instruct children. It follows further, that the father is to conduct the education after his own mind, but that the child must obey in him the Lord Himself. Finally, a very full discussion by the apostle as to the relation of slaves is only an illustration of 1 Cor. vii. 22 (§ 94, *b*). The Christian slave remains a slave, but he serves his earthly master no longer from fear and compulsion, but without eye-service and men-pleasing, with hearty goodwill, because in him he sees his heavenly Master, who has bidden him serve, and calls him to account for it (Col. iii. 22–25; Eph. vi. 5–8). The relationship of slavery has thereby lost its sting, because it can demand nothing from the slave but what he does of himself from his own free impulse, for Christ's sake. Just so the master is to give to his slave what is right and fair, to forbear threatening for the sake of the higher Master (Col. iv. 1; Eph. vi. 9). All arbitrary lordship has ceased, because the master ventures to demand nothing and to do nothing to his slave but what he is able to answer for before Christ.[11]

[11] It is self-evident, accordingly, how Paul sends back to his master the runaway slave Onesimus, whom he had converted (Philem. 11), and asks for him a reception as of a Christian brother, and pardon (vv. 16–18). He yet remains a

SECTION IV.

THE DOCTRINAL METHOD IN THE PASTORAL EPISTLES.

CHAPTER XIII.

CHRISTIANITY AS DOCTRINE.

§ 107. *The Wholesome Doctrine.*

In the Pastoral Epistles, Christianity is regarded as essentially the doctrine of the truth, on a believing knowledge of which salvation depends (*a*). There had sprung up at that time an unhealthy striving after knowledge, which, because it led away from the truth, and originated divisions, required a special emphasizing of wholesome doctrine (*b*). But this striving must everywhere be dangerous, where faith itself in its deepest roots was no longer healthy (*c*). As, therefore, wholesome doctrine stands in closest connection with pure piety, the doctrinal errors of the present are characterized as themselves symptoms of an unhealthy corruption of the religious life (*d*).

(*a*) That in the Epistles to Timothy (indicated in what follows by I., II.) and to Titus Christianity is regarded as essentially doctrine, is clear from this, that on the moral conduct of Christians it depends whether the doctrine (ἡ διδασκαλία) is exposed to reviling (I. vi. 1), or is honoured (Tit. ii. 10). The contents of this saving doctrine, which comes from God our Deliverer, is, however, according to ver. 5, just as in the earlier Epistles (§ 89, *a*), the word of God (II. ii. 9; comp. iv. 2: ὁ λόγος simply), the gospel (i. 8, 10),

slave (ver. 16; comp. ver. 11), and it springs simply from his personal relation to Onesimus as his spiritual son (ver. 10; comp. 1 Cor. iv. 15) when Paul, ver. 21 (comp. vv. 12–14), asks indirectly that Philemon would perhaps hand over the slave to him for *his own* service. Paul is not here thinking of any raising of the position of slaves, as the fulfilment of Christian duty on the part of those interested must without that completely transform that position in its essence.

or the word of truth (ii. 15).[1] If Christianity is regarded objectively as the doctrine of the truth, it can be regarded subjectively only as the knowledge of the truth (II. ii. 25, iii. 7), and this, therefore, here along with faith, is mentioned as the distinguishing mark of the Christian (I. iv. 3; Tit. i. 1). On the other hand, also, the true children, *i.e.* the disciples of the apostle, are characterized by the faith they have in common with him (Tit. i. 4; I. i. 2; comp. *οἱ πιστοί*: I. iv. 10, 12, v. 16, vi. 2), and every bond of friendship with him, which he will acknowledge, must have its root in this faith (Tit. iii. 15). For there can be no attaining a knowledge of the truth without the confident persuasion of the truth it proclaims (I. ii. 7, iv. 6), and only the word corresponding to that doctrine is a word of faith (Tit. i. 9).[2] Even there, when the apostolic

[1] The word *διδασκαλία* means, Rom. xii. 7, the work of teaching, as here, I. iv. 13, 16; II. iii. 10; Tit. ii. 7; so also, Rom. xv. 4, it means the becoming instructed, as also here, II. iii. 16; and, finally, Eph. iv. 14, Col. ii. 22, it is used of the doctrine as to its contents, as here mostly. Here also the apostle is put in trust with the gospel (I. i. 11; comp. II. ii. 8) as its *κήρυξ* (II. i. 11; I. ii. 7), and hence also the gospel is called *κήρυγμα* (Tit. i. 3; II. iv. 17; comp. iv. 2; I. iii. 16). The designation of the gospel as the word of truth is not unknown either to the earlier Epistles or to those of the imprisonment, these latter also putting a special emphasis upon knowledge (§ 102, *c*). Here, however, the truth is regarded exclusively as the truth of doctrine, and no longer, as is the case preponderatingly in earlier Paulinism, as a practical principle. On the other hand, the *λόγοι τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ* (I. vi. 3), on account of the addition *ὑγιαίνουσι*, are assuredly not the doctrines which come from Christ, but the expression designates in true Pauline fashion Christ as the object of wholesome doctrine, as II. i. 8 (*τὸ μαρτύριον τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν*; comp. I. ii. 7).

[2] The formula so common in our Epistles: *πιστὸς ὁ λόγος* (I. iii. 1; II. ii. 11; Tit. iii. 8), shows that it is peculiar to true doctrine to deserve faith, and I. i. 15, iv. 9, it is expressly declared that it is worthy a most trustful acceptation. *πίστις* does not occur in the objective sense of a content of truths, which are regarded as established doctrines, as Baur, p. 342, supposes; it is rather the form in which the truth (as the contents of right doctrine) is in the first place subjectively apprehended. Thus certainly, I. iv. 6, *τῆς πίστεως* and *τῆς καλῆς διδασκαλίας* cannot be understood as identical; *ἐν πίστει καὶ ἀληθείᾳ*, II. 17, are no *ἓν διὰ δυοῖν*, as Pfleiderer, p. 468 [E. T. ii. 201], supposes; and faith, iii. 9, is not the contents, but the possessor of the *μυστήριον* (comp. ver. 16). But compare § 108, *b*, with i. 4. If the formation of the conception of faith had with Paul started from a reference to the truth of the gospel proclamation (comp. *πίστις ἀληθείας*: 2 Thess. ii. 12, 13, and therewith § 61, *c*), and if this moment had been always kept firm hold of along with the transformation of the idea in the doctrine of justification (comp. § 82, *d*, 100, *d*), then that idea must have here again proportionately come into the foreground, when Christianity is mainly regarded as right doctrine.

proclamation is designated the gospel, it is said of it that Christ has brought immortal life to light by it, so that it appears as the means of instruction (II. i. 10: *φωτίσαντος διὰ τοῦ εὐαγγ.*; comp. 2 Cor. iv. 4, 6: *φωτισμὸς τοῦ εὐαγγελίου*). Every inspired Scripture also, to be sure (*γραφὴ θεόπνευστος*), of the Old Testament, which, according to I. iv. 13, was read in the church, is profitable for teaching and moral instruction (II. iii. 6); but the Holy Scriptures (*ἱερὰ γράμματα*) are yet only able to make wise in a really saving way (*σοφίσαι εἰς σωτηρίαν*) by means of faith in Christ (ver. 15), which therefore teaches to understand the right significance of the Scriptures, and is presupposed for their right use.[3]

(*b*) The reason why our Epistles regard Christianity mainly as doctrine lies in the circumstances of the time. Many had turned away from the truth (Tit. i. 14; comp. I. vi. 5; II. ii. 18), and it was to be feared that this would be the case in the future in yet greater numbers (iv. 4). There had arisen a gnosis, falsely so called (I. vi. 20), which, to be sure, did not appear as an error uprooting the foundations, but as an unhealthy tendency (ver. 4), a being occupied with empty, unprofitable, foolish, even profane questions of controversy (*ματαιολογία*: I. i. 6; Tit. i. 10; *μωραὶ ζητήσεις*: II. ii. 23; Tit. iii. 9; *βέβηλοι κενοφωνίαι*: II. ii. 16; I. vi. 20), which gendered only contention and discord (I. i. 4, vi. 4; II. ii. 14, 23; Tit. iii. 9).[4] In opposition to it, right doctrine

[3] That faith in Christ is anywhere implied in the Old Testament (Pfleiderer, p. 480 [E. T. ii. 213]), by no means follows from this; II. i. 5 speaks of Christian faith, and ver. 3 refers to Old Testament piety generally (comp. Acts xxiv. 14), and it has nothing to do with the dogmatic opposition between Judaism and Christianity. Even in the earlier Epistles the Scriptures of the Old Testament are spoken of as intended for teaching and instruction (Rom. xv. 4; 1 Cor. x. 11; comp. § 87, *d*), just as also, I. v. 18, the same passage from the law (Deut. xxv. 4) is turned to account in the same way as, 1 Cor. ix. 9 and II. 4, 6, the shedding of blood in the death of martyrs is regarded as a drink-offering, as Phil. ii. 17. The law in particular is good (*καλός*, comp. Rom. vii. 16), but only if it is used *νομίμως*, *i.e.* conformably to the end involved in it (I. i. 8). And this end points in this direction, that it is abrogated for the Christian, as he is already *δίκαιος* (comp. § 87, *a*), and has its significance only for the un-Christian sinners (vv. 9, 10). And this has no doubt to be understood in the sense of § 72, *b*, as ver. 11 expressly refers to the Pauline Gospel, a matter which Pfleiderer, p. 481 [E. T. ii. 213], overlooks.

[4] The *αἱρετικὸς ἄνθρωπος* (Tit. iii. 10) is not a heretic in the later sense of the word, but one who produces divisions (*αἱρέσεις*, in the sense of 1 Cor. xi. 19; Gal.

appears (ἡ καλὴ διδασκαλία: I. iv. 6) as sound doctrine (i. 10; Tit. i. 9, ii. 1), as λόγοι ὑγιαίνοντες (I. vi. 3; II. i. 13; comp. Tit. ii. 8), and the contents of this sound doctrine is the truth (II. iv. 3; comp. ver. 4). But with sound doctrine faith also, conformably to its nature, seems to be threatened (I. iv. 1, vi. 10); those who have missed the goal of the truth mislead the faith of others (II. ii. 18). Whoever yields to a striving after false knowledge, misses the end of faith (I. vi. 21: περὶ τὴν πίστιν ἠστόχησαν), which naturally consists of an ever firmer conviction of the truth and the perfect sufficiency of sound doctrine; and whoever has come to be unstable in faith, has turned aside to ματαιολογία (I. i. 6).

(*c*) It is not every faith which is endangered by these errors of doctrine; where faith is healthy (Tit. i. 13, ii. 2), it will maintain its ground; for those only who have swerved from unfeigned faith turn aside to ματαιολογία (I. i. 5, 6). Healthy faith rests on a good conscience (ἀγαθή or καθαρὰ συνείδησις: II. 1, 3), from purity of heart, which really cares for the truth, and only for the truth. A pure conscience is similarly the vessel in which the mystery of the faith is preserved (I. iii. 9). Whoever allows it frivolously and indifferently to be lost, and thus as it were puts it away from him (ἣν . . . ἀπωσάμενοι), has made shipwreck of faith (i. 19). When the good conscience fails in purity in its strivings after truth, then faith is no longer unfeigned (II. i. 5); and when the conviction is no longer upright, then naturally it is easy to turn away the interest from the truth to other things.[5]

v. 20). There is no special mildness expressed towards these false teachers (Baur, p. 343), but a mildness which lies in the nature of the case. There are false teachers which are here branded as of the devil (I. iv. 1), but these are to be dreaded only in the future: the existing error is an ἑτεροδιδασκαλεῖν (i. 3, vi. 3), a teaching strange things, which one had best simply turn away from (iv. 7; Tit. iii. 9; II. ii. 16), without even entering on a discussion about them (ii. 23, 24). For this activity only becomes dangerous if there is a hardening towards the truth (Tit. i. 9; II. iii. 8), when one has then, to be sure, simply to stop the mouths of talkers (Tit. i. 10, 11).

[5] There is therefore also a faith which one persuades oneself and others of, as there is a hypocrisy of deceitful teachers who do not believe even their own doctrines; and it results in this, that such bear a brand on their conscience (I. iv. 2), so far as it is stained with the consciousness of hypocrisy and insincerity (comp. Tit. i. 15). Just so must the calling upon the Lord, *i.e.* the specific expression of faith, proceed from a clean, *i.e.* sincere motive of a free heart (II. ii. 22). And thus, naturally, it is all one whether the impurity by which the good

Thus our Epistles trace the errors resulting from a striving after knowledge back to an unhealthy condition of faith, which has its deepest reason in the want of that purity of heart which is evidenced by a good conscience. But this plainly can exist only where there is no lack of the fundamental condition of all religious life—of *εὐσέβεια*. This favourite expression of our Epistles designates true piety (comp. I. ii. 10: *θεοσέβεια*), which, where it is not feigned, must show itself energetic (II. iii. 5), and must pervade and determine the whole life (ver. 12; Tit. ii. 12;[6] I. ii. 2); it must hence be striven after before everything else (iv. 7), as the true gain (ver. 8, vi. 6). The *μυστήριον τῆς πίστεως* (I. iii. 9) is at the same time a *μυστήριον τῆς εὐσεβείας* (ver. 16), because true piety only can lead to faith in the truth, and neither the one nor the other can exist with immorality. Every violation of immediate moral duty is a denial of the faith, and lowers even beneath the unbelieving (v. 8); while, inversely, love springs from unfeigned faith (i. 5).

(*d*) Not only does true faith depend on piety, but our Epistles also bring into the strongest prominence the inner relationship of sound doctrine with godliness. The *μυστήριον τῆς εὐσεβείας* is even as to its contents nothing but the *ἀλήθεια* (I. iii. 15, 16), and hence this law is also called, Tit. i. 1, the truth, which is according to godliness related to it. Just so the doctrine, which proclaims this truth, is *ἡ κατ' εὐσέβειαν διδασκαλία* (I. vi. 3), and this is, according to the

conscience is lost consists in the lack of an upright striving after the truth, or in a sinful inclination to earthly good things. Even the inclination of the heart to greed is connected with the loss of a good conscience, which is shown in severe stings of conscience, and hence leads to a wandering from faith (I. vi. 10); for a mind directed to earthly things cannot have a pure striving after the truth—a striving which leads to an unfeigned and therefore an immoveable conviction.

[6] As in this passage *δικαίως* occurs along with *εὐσεβῶς*, so similarly *ὅσιος* (comp. I. ii. 8) occurs with *δίκαιος*: Tit. i. 8 (comp. Eph. iv. 24; *δικαιοσύνη καὶ ὁσιότης*; 1 Thess. ii. 10: *ὁσίως καὶ δικαίως*). As *εὐσέβεια* is allied to the *pietas* of children (I. v. 4), so impiety (*ἀνόσιος*) appears (II. iii. 2) along with disobedience and ingratitude towards parents. It is not correct when Baur, p. 341, asserts that in our Epistles, in place of the Pauline *πίστις*, we have the general idea of religiousness. As *εὐσέβεια*, I. vi. 11, occurs along with *πίστις*, it is clear from what has been said that it must rather be the basis of life from which true faith springs. Of piety towards the awakened common consciousness of the Church (Pfleiderer, p. 477 [E. T. ii. 210]), there is thus nothing said.

context, sound doctrine. On the one hand, the more that our Epistles are moved to regard Christianity as doctrine, all the more do they emphasize this, that it does not thereby deal with a summary of theoretical truths that have nothing to do with godliness. As godliness comprehends an entire moral walk (note *c*), so also there lies in the healthy doctrine connected with it all the motives to that right moral exhortation (Tit. i. 9, ii. 1), which is at the same time the task of the teacher (I. v. 1, vi. 2; II. iv. 2; Tit. ii. 6, 15). Every kind of sin, which in its deepest roots is *ἀσεβές* and *ἀνόσιον* (I. i. 9), contradicts wholesome doctrine (ver. 10). On the other hand, the doctrinal errors of the time are characterized as the appearing of an unhealthy corruption of the deepest tendency of the religious life. The loss of the truth, like the inability to believe, is traced back, in the first place, to an unhealthy corruption of the *νοῦς*, *i.e.* of the natural organ for the consciousness of God and of sin (§ 68, *c*; I. vi. 5; II. iii. 8); but this corruption is caused by oneself. The turning away from sound doctrine goes hand in hand with a predilection for such teachers as tickle the ear, while they teach only such things as correspond to the sinful inclinations of the hearers (*κατὰ τὰς ἰδίας ἐπιθυμίας*: II. iv. 3, 4). The false teachers are greedy of gain (Tit. i. 11), and make use of what they bring before themselves, as their piety (the *μόρφωσις εὐσεβείας*: II. iii. 5), as a means of gain (I. vi. 5). The fundamental tendency of their nature is *ἀσέβεια*.[7]

[7] While the idea of *εὐσέβεια* does not occur in the earlier Epistles, according to § 69, *b*, *ἀσέβεια* appears as the characteristic mark of the pre-Christian, and in particular of the heathen condition; and just so is it here, Tit. ii. 12 (comp. I. i. 9). If the profane, empty talk of the false teachers, wherever any countenance was given to it, led down ever more deeply to irreligiousness (II. ii. 16), it must be *à priori* allied to this, as sound doctrine is allied to piety. Even on that account, he who has been entangled in false doctrine can attain to the knowledge of the truth only by repentance (ii. 25), and hence he needs a *παιδεύειν* (comp. I. i. 20), *ἐλέγχειν* (Tit. i. 9, 13; comp. II. iv. 2), *νουθετεῖν* (Tit. iii. 10). But whoever, on the contrary, gets hardened, is to be regarded as an incorrigible transgressor, who has pronounced his own condemnation (ver. 11). The great danger of unsound doctrine lies even in this, that, like a cancer, it rankles, because it finds in the diseased condition of the religious life ever fresh nourishment (II. ii. 17).

§ 108. *The Paulinism of the Pastoral Epistles.*

The contents of the wholesome doctrine is the message of the deliverance of sinners in Christ, a deliverance which conducts to eternal life in fellowship with the risen Christ, and to a share in the divine glory (*a*). Here also the saving principle is the grace of God, and that principle as justifying, which rests on the redeeming death of Christ, and is appropriated by faith in the sense of saving trust (*b*). The new life, described, no doubt, partly in a peculiar way, rests on the gift of the Spirit in baptism, and in its further development it is advanced by the grace of God (*c*). But the truth is not thereby excluded, that deliverance and life continue dependent on human conduct, and may hence be regarded from the point of view of retribution (*d*).

(*a*) The doctrine of our Epistles can be none other than that which Paul, the teacher and apostle of the Gentiles (I. ii. 7; II. i. 11, 13; comp. iv. 7), has proclaimed, and, in fact, it proceeds on the joyful message, that God is willing to deliver all men (I. ii. 4). This presupposes that all men need deliverance, and without it have fallen into perdition (ὄλεθρος καὶ ἀπώλεια: I. vi. 9; comp. § 64, *b*; 66, *d*).[1] Wholesome doctrine points the way to deliverance; for whoever abides by it helps his hearers as well (I. iv. 16; comp. II. ii. 10, iii. 15). In

[1] To remind us of the need of salvation, the pre-Christian condition of *all* men (Tit. iii. 3; while the ἡμεῖς expressly includes the former Jews), which gave occasion for this deliverance (ver. 3), is characterized as a wandering away (πλανώμενοι), and this is a result of the corruption of the νοῦς (ἀνόητοι), and comes about from disobedience (ἀπειθεῖς) in principle, a disobedience which issues in subjection to the desires (δουλεύοντες ἐπιθυμίαις), and in sins of uncharitableness. This picture reminds one in several ways of the description given of heathenism in the earlier Epistles (§ 69); and even the Jews are, as regards their conduct, no better than the heathen, and even below them as a matter of fact. It appears to me the words, Tit. i. 15, 16, must in particular be understood of the unbelieving Jews. They acknowledge God, but deny Him by their works (comp. Rom. ii. 17, 22); in spite of their aversion to idols (Rom. ii. 22), they are themselves βδελυκτοί; in spite of their zeal for the law (ver. 23), they are ἀπειθεῖς as well as the heathen. In consequence of this, their νοῦς as well as their συνείδησις (comp. § 107, c, *d*) are stained with sin. Here also are the lusts, which lead to perdition (I. vi. 9), the characteristic mark of the pre-Christian condition (Tit. iii. 3, ii. 12: κοσμικαὶ ἐπιθυμίαι). It is noteworthy, on the other hand, that sin is never traced back to the σάρξ, while the repeated mention of the νοῦς reminds one very much of the specially Pauline psychology.

this emphasizing of the *σωτηρία* our Epistles remind us very much of the earliest form of Paul's apostolic preaching to the Gentiles, as also of the first apostolic preaching (comp. § 61). It is, however, peculiar to our Epistles, that God Himself is usually designated our Deliverer (Tit. iii. 4).[2] Here also the positive object of Christian hope, whose author is Christ (I. i. 1; comp. Col. i. 27), is eternal life (Tit. iii. 7), to which Christians are called (I. vi. 12). This life has been promised from the very beginning (in all the prophets) by God, who cannot lie (Tit. i. 2); but Christ has manifested Himself as our *σωτήρ*, while He has brought *ζωὴν καὶ ἀφθαρσίαν* to light by the gospel (II. i. 10), and in conformity with the promise of the life grounded on Him (*i.e.*, as § 96, *c*, in fellowship of life with the Risen One; comp. ii. 8, 11), He hath sent out His apostles (i. 1). That this immortal, and therefore only true life (*ἡ ὄντως ζωή*: I. vi. 19), is here also regarded as brought about by the resurrection, as § 97, *a*, is proved by the polemic against a spiritualistic perversion of it (II. ii. 18). Conformably to this hope we are become, according to Tit. iii. 7, *κληρονόμοι*,[3] and thus heirs of the divine glory. For, according to II. ii. 10, deliverance is connected with eternal glory, and the contents of the gospel can therefore be designated as the glory of the blessed God (I. i. 11), in which we, according to our blessed hope, are to participate (Tit. ii. 13). For, connected with this also, as § 97, *d*, it is given them to reign with Christ (II. ii. 12), who in His glory leaves the government of the world with God.

(*b*) There can therefore be no doubt about this, that here

[2] As such it is He, from whom Christian doctrine comes (Tit. ii. 10), by whose command it is proclaimed by the apostle (I. i. 1; Tit. i. 3), who wills the salvation of all (I. ii. 3, 4; comp. moreover, 1 Cor. i. 21), and on whom therefore the hope of the Christian rests (I. iv. 10; comp. v. 5, vi. 17). If it is said (II. i. 9; Tit. iii. 5) that He *has delivered us*, we see, as also § 96, *b*, that the deliverance may be regarded proleptically as already accomplished so soon as the institutions needful for it are referred to. Naturally Christ also is designated our Deliverer (Tit. i. 4, iii. 6; comp. Eph. v. 23; Phil. iii. 20), who appeared as such on the earth (II. i. 10; I. i. 15: *ἁμαρτωλοὺς σῶσαι*), and appears again at His Parousia (Tit. ii. 13; comp. II. iv. 18: *σώσει εἰς τ. βασιλ.*), and on this account deliverance rests on Him (II. ii. 10), and the Gospel testifies of Him (i. 8, ii. 8).

[3] This is the only passage in which the Pauline idea of sonship, to which that of heirship forms the correlation, is announced in our Epistles. Nowhere is God spoken of as our Father, though Christians are called *ἀδελφοί* (I. iv. 6, vi. 2; II. iv. 21).

too, as § 75, *c*, the grace of God is the effective principle of salvation. In the appearance of Christ, to which, no doubt, *ἐπεφάνη* intentionally alludes, has appeared God's grace bringing salvation (Tit. ii. 11: *ἡ χάρις τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡ σωτήριος*), —a grace which was given to Christians even in the eternal purpose of salvation, and in Christ, to be sure (II. i. 9; comp. § 103, *a*), and it appeared too, ii. 1, resting in Him as the Redeemer.[4] In Tit. iii. 7, grace appears expressly as justifying, and that quite in the forensic sense of the earlier Epistles, as the hope of the child's portion in eternal life is connected with it (comp. note *a*). But that this eternal life can be brought to light depends on this, that Christ, as our *σωτήρ*, has stripped death of his power (II. i. 10: *καταργήσας τὸν θάνατον*); and this can be understood only from the fact that He by His substitutionary death has taken from death, which on account of sin lorded it over us, its claim on us; so also the self-surrender of Christ appears, I. ii. 6, as *ἀντίλυτρον ὑπὲρ πάντων*.[5]

[4] That, therefore, in the introductory salutations, grace, which works all the salvation of men, is given by God and Christ (I. i. 2; II. i. 2; Tit. i. 4), quite corresponds to the Pauline method. The way, also, in which the proof of grace given to Paul in his calling to the apostleship, which consisted essentially in this, that Christ in all His long-suffering (I. i. 16) overlooked his former enmity (ver. 13), is designated (ver. 14) His exceeding abundant grace, has its analogy also, according to § 75, *c*, in the earlier Epistles. It is most striking that, in the introductory salutations of the Epistles (I. i. 2; II. i. 2), mercy appears as quite parallel with effectual grace, and to this mercy also, I. i. 13, 16, Paul's conversion, Tit. iii. 5, the deliverance of all men, are traced (comp. II. i. 16, 18), and that, Tit. iii. 4 (comp. with ii. 11), the goodness of God and His love to men occur in place of *χάρις*. The technical idea of *χάρις*, in its distinction from *ἔλεος* and *χρηστότης*, appears accordingly to be no longer quite so firmly retained here, as § 75, *c*; § 100, *c*, footnote 6. It is also peculiar that in the concluding benediction the accompaniment of grace is simply asked for the readers (I. vi. 2; II. iv. 22; Tit. iii. 15).

[5] We are not at all reminded by the first passage of the Johannine connection of *ζωή* and *φῶς* (Pfleiderer, p. 475 [E. T. ii. 208]), but the second passage does remind us of the Pauline *ἀπολύτρωσις* (§ 80, *c*), and also of Mark x. 45. Elsewhere the object of this self-surrender (*ὃς ἔδωκεν ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν*) is indicated, when, Tit. ii. 14, it is described as a cleansing from the sin of *ἀνομία* (comp. i. 15, according to which Christians, in contrast to unbelievers, are *καθαροί*). That this, regarded as the indirect result of Christ's death, is not un-Pauline, as Baur, p. 339, supposes, is shown in § 81, *b*; 100, *c*; and Pfleiderer in the passage above has not proven that it is the indirect result; but when the idea of *λύτρωσις* is connected with it (*ἵνα λυτρώσηται ἡμᾶς*), it reminds us, at any rate, rather of the Petrine method of teaching (§ 49, *d*). Ritschl, ii. p. 179, finds here a combination of the types of the paschal offering and of the covenant offering, but there is nothing in the context to suggest this in the least.

And also if justification is not itself put in contrast with works, yet grace, which effects it, does appear, II. i. 9, quite as § 75, *b*, in contrast with all merit of works (*οὐ κατὰ τὰ ἔργα ἡμῶν*), and similarly Tit. iii. 5, deliverance as not proceeding from works (*οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων*), which were done by men in the condition of their normal quality of life (*ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ*). If, on the other hand, Baur, p. 339, in spite of the antithesis to all merit by works in our Epistles, misses the Pauline thesis of justifying faith, it is clear, in the first place, from I. i. 4, that here also the specific nature of the new divine institution of salvation consists in faith (*οἰκονομία Θεοῦ ἡ ἐν πίστει*). But this faith appears as the subjective condition of the working of God's grace (ver. 14: *ὑπερεπλεόνασεν ἡ χάρις . . . μετὰ πίστεως*; comp. Luke i. 58), and of the deliverance achieved by it (ii. 15).[6]

(*c*) If baptism, Tit. iii. 5 (*λουτρόν*, comp. Eph. v. 26), is designated the medium of deliverance, this expression has a direct analogy rather with Peter (comp. § 44, *b*) than in the Pauline Epistles; but the way in which this meaning of baptism is thought to be brought about is yet quite Pauline. For the *παλιγγενεσία* is but another expression for the new creation effected in baptism; and if Baur, p. 340, declares it a determination foreign to Paul to connect the gift of the Spirit with baptism, then that is plainly not correct, according

[6] Faith, which conducts to eternal life, is quite Pauline—confidence resting on Christ as the Mediator of salvation (I. i. 16: *πιστεύειν ἐπ' αὐτῷ*), a confidence which, according to iii. 13 (*ἡ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ*), first gives the full assurance of salvation, or a confidence given to God, the author of salvation (II. i. 12; Tit. iii. 8). That *πίστις ἡ ἐν Χριστῷ* in II. iii. 15 appears to stand for faith, in the sense of § 107, *a*, has, according to § 82, *d*, footnote 12, its analogies even in the earlier Epistles, when, likewise, that earlier idea of faith occurs along with the idea of it stamped in the doctrine of justification. *Πίστις* occurs much more frequently, no doubt, co-ordinated with love and other Christian graces (I. i. 14, ii. 15; II. i. 13, iii. 10; Tit. ii. 2), as in the earlier Epistles (comp. § 106, *b*, footnote 6), so also with love preceding (I. iv. 12), or righteousness (II. ii. 22), or righteousness and piety (I. vi. 11). But, on the one hand, I. i. 5, where faith is expressly designated the source of love, shows that there is not necessarily any logical co-ordinations intended in such enumerations; and, on the other hand, it may seem doubtful whether we ought not to think, in most of these passages, of the grace of fidelity, for which *πίστις* stands, I. v. 12; II. iv. 7 (comp. *πιστός*, I. i. 12, iii. 11; II. ii. 2, 13). In our Epistles also, according to § 107, *c*, the religious moral character of faith is quite differently emphasized.

to § 84, *a*.[7] But God has poured out the Holy Spirit through Christ (ver. 6), and He dwells in us (II. i. 14). He is the Spirit of prophecy (I. iv. 1; comp. the προφητεῖαι: i. 18, iv. 14), but above all, in truly Pauline fashion, He is the Principle of renewal (Tit. iii. 5: ἀνακαίνωσις; comp. Rom. xii. 2; Col. iii. 10), and of the new Christian life, because He works the power and the love and the sound mind in man needful thereto (II. i. 7), and enables him to fulfil his calling courageously (ver. 14).[8] Here also δικαιοσύνη is finally and really bestowed by grace (I. i. 9; II. iv. 8; Tit. i. 8), if also it has to be ever more perfectly realized by a ready striving after it (I. vi. 11; II. ii. 22). But divine grace itself also draws us, as do also the Holy Scriptures when rightly understood

[7] Reference is, to be sure, made in our passage to deliverance from destruction; not in so far as the guilt of sin inflicts that on men, but in so far as the sinful condition of the pre-Christian life (ver. 3) involves that; but Eph. ii. 5–8 is quite analogous, and in the earlier Epistles also the new creation is quite as necessary for salvation as is justification. It would no doubt be un-Pauline, if in ver. 7 justification appeared as the result of the deliverance effected by the new birth (ver. 5), or of the gift of the Spirit (ver. 6; comp. Pfleiderer, p. 476 [E. T. ii. 208]); but this connection of thought is by no means indicated. Rather there is introduced in the clause denoting intention only the reference to justification, because the obtaining eternal life (which is here, according to note *a*, the correlative of σωτηρία, ver. 5) is here to be designated as the child's portion, which in the real Pauline way can be shared by those adopted on the ground of their adoption. The position of justification after the new birth involves here, therefore, as little as 1 Cor. vi. 11 or Eph. ii. 15, 16, a logical *consequens;* but it is no doubt possible that both are considered independent acts of God's grace, standing in no causal connection (comp. § 84, *d*, footnote 18; § 101, *a*). Ritschl, ii. p. 334 f., comes essentially to the same result, though he in a surprising way, p. 333, questions the reference of λουτρόν to baptism, and explains the passage by Old Testament parallels not hinted at in the least.

[8] The Spirit is plainly meant by the power of God, by which He Himself helps the Christians to suffer for the gospel (ver. 8), and to execute their calling (ver. 12), and therefore the grace of God may also be directly designated as that which communicates strength to us (ii. 1), and God Himself as He who helps those to repentance who have gone astray (ver. 25). On the other hand, Christ may also be designated as He who strengthens Christians (I. i. 12; II. iv. 17), whose helpful company is on that account asked (II. iv. 22) for the new life of the Spirit (comp. § 86, *b*). Only once, it is true, is the specifically Christian εὐσεβῶς ζῆν characterized as a life in fellowship with Christ (II. iii. 12: ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ; comp. § 84, *b*), and love is twice characterized as ἡ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ (I. i. 14; II. i. 13); but that the whole rich circle of thoughts, which in Paulinism has been built round this idea, is current in our Epistles, II. ii. 11, 12, shows where the final living with Christ and reigning with Christ is made dependent on dying with Him (comp. § 84, *c*).

(II. iii. 16), to the denial of *ἀσέβεια* (or *ἀδικία*; comp. II. ii. 19) and *κοσμικαὶ ἐπιθυμίαι*, *i.e.* of the pre-Christian sinful life, as also to *σωφρόνως καὶ δικαίως καὶ εὐσεβῶς ζῆν* (Tit. ii. 11, 12). That *εὐσέβεια*, which must form the deepest basis of all *living* acceptably to God, is here associated with righteousness, will be easily understood, according to § 107, *c.* But the preceding idea of *σωφροσύνη*, *i.e.* moral self-government, which keeps the desires (II. iv. 3) under control (comp. i. 7: *πνεῦμα σωφρονισμοῦ*), is peculiar to our Epistles.[9]

(*d*) With the earnest exhortation to verify wholesome doctrine by a normal Christian moral life, is intimately connected the importance of good works in our Epistles; and this is by no means un-Pauline in itself, if one does not, with Baur, p. 341, assert that the essence of Christianity is placed in them. Rather it is most truly Pauline that, while man in his pre-Christian state (Tit. i. 16) is incapable of any good works, he is first equipped for them by Christianity (iii. 1; II. ii. 21, iii. 17; comp. 2 Cor. ix. 8), and inclined to them, inasmuch as Christ's own people are as to their nature a people *ζηλωτὴς καλῶν ἔργων* (Tit. ii. 14), and the leader of the Church is a *τύπος καλῶν ἔργων* (ii. 7; comp. I. iv. 12).[10] To trace all

[9] It is demanded not only of the bishops (I. iii. 2; Tit. i. 8), but also of old and young men (ii. 2, 6), and above all of women (ii. 5; I. ii. 9; comp. II. iii. 6). With this are connected also the repeated exhortations to sobriety (I. iii. 2, 11; Tit. ii. 2) and temperance (i. 8), especially from excessive use of wine (i. 7, ii. 3; I. iii. 3, 8). In the earlier Epistles *σωφροσύνη* stands, 2 Cor. v. 13, only for a sound mind in opposition to insanity, and Rom. xii. 3 for a healthy modesty in self-estimation. A kindred idea is *ἁγνεία*, which at times designates moral purity generally (I. iv. 12, v. 22), at other times it is used with reference to sins of the flesh in particular, as § 84, *d*, footnote 14 (I. v. 2; Tit. ii. 5). On the contrary, *ἁγιασμός* is connected with *σωφροσύνη*, according to I. ii. 15, and according to II. ii. 21, it can be realized by abstinence from all uncleanness, especially of the false teachers and of those who have fallen away. Only I. v. 10 are Christians called simply *ἅγιοι*. On the other side, again, *σεμνότης*, *i.e.* what is honourable and dignified in the exhibition of Christian morality, is connected with *εὐσέβεια* (I. ii. 2; comp. Phil. iv. 8). It is also required of old men (Tit. ii. 2), as also of children (I. iii. 4), of the deacons and their wives (iii. 8, 11), as also of the teachers of the Church (Tit. ii. 7). Regarding external things, especially in clothing (I. ii. 9), *κόσμιος* occurs (iii. 2).

[10] Moreover, *καλὰ ἔργα* appears to occur not only in this general sense (I. v. 25), but also specially for deeds of love, for which women (v. 10; comp. ii. 10), the rich (vi. 18), and even all Christians are to be distinguished (Tit. iii. 8, 14). As the Christian cardinal virtue, namely love, appears here, which

salvation, as is done in the earlier Epistles, to the grace of God, does not exclude the idea that the perfecting of salvation continues dependent on men's conduct. And doubtless, just as in the earlier Epistles, it is in the first place abiding in the faith (*σωθήσεται . . . ἐὰν μείνωσιν ἐν πίστει*), but at the same time perseverance in the Christian life (I. ii. 15), the faithful discharging of the special calling given to the individual (iv. 16: *τοῦτο ποιῶν . . . σεαυτὸν σώσεις*), and in particular patience in suffering (II. ii. 10, comp. with vv. 11, 12), by which salvation is attained (comp. § 98, *b*). Hence, if the Scriptures are able to lead to *σωτηρία* through their power to teach and nourish, that presupposes that faith teaches to understand them aright (iii. 15, 16). Just so is the obtaining of eternal life (I. i. 16) made dependent on faith, and that life appears, vi. 12, as the reward of the fight which faith has to fight for its verification, especially in these times of danger (comp. § 107, *b*).[11] From the point of view of such retribution, godliness may be represented as gain (I. vi. 6), and as bringing profit (comp. 1 Cor. xiii. 3, xv. 32); but also not in so far it merits anything, but in so far it has a promise of this (comp. Eph. vi. 3), and of the future life (I. iv. 8), on the

is hence (I. i. 5) the end aimed at (comp. ver. 3) in the warning against *ἑτεροδιδασκαλία*, which, i. 14, ii. 15, iv. 12, II. i. 13, is mentioned along with *πίστις* as the most necessary (comp. note *b*, footnote 6), which before all others the Holy Spirit works in man (i. 7), and which is elsewhere specially emphasized among the Christian virtues (ii. 22). As indications of this, there appear here also *ἐπιείκεια* (I. iii. 3; Tit. iii. 2; comp. Phil. iv. 5), which avoids every occasion for contention and quarrelling (I. iii. 3; Tit. ii. 2: *ἄμαχος*; comp. II. ii. 22, 24; Tit. i. 7), *πραότης* (II. ii. 25; Tit. iii. 2), and *μακροθυμία* (II. iii. 10, iv. 2), which suppresses wrath (I. ii. 8; Tit. i. 7) and every outbreak of it (I. iii. 3; Tit. i. 7), hospitality (Tit. i. 8; I. iii. 2; comp. v. 10), and all covetousness (I. iii. 3; II. iii. 2), which excludes all greediness of gain (I. iii. 8; Tit. i. 7; comp. the exhortation to contentment, I. vi. 6–8), and intercession for all men (I. ii. 1, v. 5), comp. § 93, *b*.

[11] This reminds one of the way in which Paul has elsewhere found the doctrine of retribution to be reconcilable with his doctrine of grace (§ 98, *d*), and thus it is, II. ii. 5, expressly said that the crown of victory will only then be given when one fights *νομίμως*, and, according to iv. 8, the Righteous Judge will give the crown which rewards human righteousness (comp. § 65, *c*) to those who have faithfully fought the good fight through (comp. also I. i. 18; II. ii. 3, 4, and therewith 2 Cor. x. 4), and in consequence have earnestly looked for His appearing. Ritschl's (ii. p. 113) idea, that here, in correlation with the human *δικαιοσύνη*, there is a change in the divine, is quite unjustified, as it is supported simply by dogmatic opinions of his own.

ground of which alone trouble and shame may be endured (ver. 10).[12] But retributive judgment is also determined by works (II. iv. 14; comp. 2 Cor. xi. 15), and, ii. 12, stress is laid on the equivalent of this, with plain allusion to a saying of Christ (Matt. x. 33). Although all this cannot be called un-Pauline, it must yet be conceded that this bringing of the doctrine of retribution into strong prominence reminds one rather, as even the accord with Christ's sayings shows, of the type of early apostolic teaching (comp. § 51, *d*; 57, *b*). Especially the way in which, according to II. i. 16, 18, Christ will admit him to mercy who has practised mercy, reminds strongly of Jas. ii. 13.

§ 109. *The Church and the Management of the Community.*

In spite of the universality of God's saving will, our Epistles acknowledge an election and a calling of the individual (*a*). But the Church is no longer the fellowship of the elect; these form only the indestructible stock of the Church (*b*). The apostle's delegates guide the community by exhortation and instruction, by doctrine, and especially by care in keeping the doctrine pure in the future (*c*). The management of the relations of the community depends, above all, on the appointment of office-bearers, bishops, and deacons, and on discipline over it (*d*).

(*a*) In the true Pauline way (comp. § 88, 89), the apostleship seems, in Tit. i. 1, to be appointed to nourish faith in God's elect by the effectual power of the preaching of the gospel (*ἀπόστολος . . . κατὰ πίστιν ἐκλεκτῶν Θεοῦ*), as it

[12] The passages I. iii. 13 and vi. 9 appear remarkable. According to the former, the faithful discharge of a special calling (*οἱ καλῶς διακονήσαντες*) wins a good stage, *i.e.* not certainly a higher stage of blessedness (Pfleiderer, p. 479 [E. T. ii. 212]), but a stage by which one steps up to deliverance (comp. iv. 16). But while it is added immediately, *καὶ πολλὴν παῤῥησίαν ἐν πίστει*, it is clear that that deals with the confirmation of faith, its confidence grows with its confirmation up to completeness. According to the other passage, they who employ their riches aright store up a good foundation for the future, proceeding on which, as it were, they may reach some day the reward of eternal life (comp. ver. 12). But that at the last judgment, when the possession of eternal life will be decided, inquiry will be made for works, the earlier Epistles also teach (§ 98, *c*); the form of expression in our passage is evidently ruled by the play of thought, that he who uses aright his treasures gathers for himself treasures in heaven, and it evidently re-echoes a saying of Christ (Matt. vi. 20).

is also, according to II. ii. 10, the business of an apostle to work for the perfecting of the salvation of the elect.[1] As the calling appears also, i. 9, as the first step towards the realization, and along with that, as the token and earnest of the election, this calling, as proceeding from God, is called holy (*καλέσας κλήσει ἁγίᾳ*), and warrants eternal life (I. vi. 12). Here also is Paul the apostle of Jesus Christ by the will of God (II. i. 1; Tit. i. 1; comp. I. i. 1: *κατ' ἐπιταγὴν Θεοῦ*), because Christ placed him in His *διακονία* for the purpose designated (I. i. 12).[2] The more decidedly the special Pauline doctrine of election is thus brought into prominence, it is the less likely that our Epistles should teach a universalism irreconcilable with it, as Baur, p. 347, supposes. But in the passage I. ii. 4, the reference to God's gracious will, which at least intended salvation for all men, simply accounts for an intercession which excludes no one (vv. 1–3), but cannot on that account mean a purpose of election determining salvation, as it is also made to lean on the unity of God and of the Redeemer appointed by Him (ver. 5), quite as the real Pauline universalism of the divine purpose of salvation (Rom. iii. 29). On the contrary, iv. 10, a distinction is expressly made between the sense in which God is the *σωτήρ* of all men, and that in which He is the *σωτήρ* of the (elect) believers (*μάλιστα πιστῶν*); and this can consist only in this, that He is really for the latter what He might be according to His love for the former (ii. 4). Finally, in

[1] Whether, II. i. 9, the divine predestination (*πρόθεσις*) refers to the appointment of the individual to salvation, or only to the eternal purpose of God generally, may appear doubtful, although the express opposition to one's own works, and the whole context, which is to give certainty to the individual, that God as the result of the calling, which followed on the ground of His own eternal purpose, will give to him the power to discharge the duty laid on him, decide conclusively for the first interpretation. If, I. v. 21, mention is made of *ἐκλεκτοὶ ἄγγελοι*, *ἐκλεκτός* stands here in the sense of chosen, as Rom. xvi. 13.

[2] It is in harmony with the Pauline doctrine of the divine foreknowledge (comp. § 88, *c*), when it is said that Christ counted the former blasphemer and persecutor (comp. 1 Cor. xv. 9) as faithful, because He knew that he did it in ignorance (I. i. 12, 13), as he witnesses of himself also, II. i. 3, that he had served God from his forefathers with a pure conscience. That naturally does not exclude the idea, that it was in virtue of grace and mercy, if Christ, notwithstanding the greatness of his guilt, accepted him for an apostle (I. i. 13, 14); yea, even that mercy was shown to him, the chief of sinners (comp. Eph. iii. 8), for the purpose that for all time coming he might be regarded as a pattern (vv. 15, 16).

the passage Tit. ii. 11, the πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις is simply to set forth the paedagogic intention of the divine revelation of salvation as binding on all classes and orders, according to the special prescriptions for them individually, vv. 1–10.

(*b*) In the earlier Epistles, the community consists only of those plainly elected (comp. § 92, *a*, footnote 2). In the passage II. ii. 20, on the other hand, the statement is applied to the house of God, *i.e.* the Church,[3] that in that house there are very different vessels, and there is in particular laid down a fundamental difference between those who are for honourable and those for dishonourable use (comp. Rom. ix. 21). But that the σκεύη εἰς τιμήν are really the elect, and that these, therefore, form but a part of the community (even though its proper foundation-stone), is undoubtedly implied in the connection with ver. 19.[4] Hence this foundation-stone bears the inscription: "The Lord knows them that are His," as, according to note *a*, footnote 2, every election rests on the divine foreknowledge; while the other inscription points to the truth, that the subjective security of belonging to this foundation consists only in steady separation from all unrighteousness (the σκεύη εἰς ἀτιμίαν; comp. ver. 21), the objective rests on the divine election. The reason for this divergence from the earlier Paulinism lies clearly in the experiences which our Epistles presuppose. Cases had occurred of individuals

[3] According to I. iii. 15, the Church (ἐκκλησία τοῦ Θεοῦ, as iii. 5, v. 16, is said of single churches) is the οἶκος Θεοῦ, *i.e.* but not in the sense of the temple of God, from § 92, *a* (Baur, p. 342), but the household of God (comp. Eph. ii. 19 : οἰκεῖοι Θεοῦ), in which God is the master of the house (II. ii. 21 : δεσπότης), and the bishops act as His stewards (Tit. i. 7 : οἰκονόμοι Θεοῦ, as 1 Cor. iv. 1, ix. 17). In another relation the collective community is spoken of as the peculiar people of God (ii. 14 : λαὸς περιούσιος; comp. § 45, *a*), but this rests simply on His κυριότης.

[4] The customary interpretation of this verse (comp. even yet Pfleiderer, p. 469 [E. T. ii. 201], the consequences drawn from it by him do not hence quite correspond) overlooks the fact that, in contrast to those whose faith may be overturned by false teachers (ver. 18), the foundation of God nevertheless standing firm (ὁ μέντοι στερεὸς θεμέλιος τοῦ Θεοῦ ἕστηκεν), can only be that portion of the community to whom any such ἀναστροφή is not possible, because it is preserved through all temptations on the ground of election. In this figure the Church, just as § 92, *b*, is regarded as a building of God; but the application of it, according to which the immoveable foundation is no longer Christ, but the fellowship of the elect, results from this, that only the elect compose the unchangeable portion of the community, and it corresponds to the idea, likewise answering to the position of the times, according to which the Church is no longer the receiver, but the guardian of the truth (I. iii. 15 : στῦλος καὶ ἑδραίωμα τ. ἀληθ.).

having turned from the right way and followed Satan (I. v. 15), had been taken by the devil[5] in his snares (II. ii. 26), that individuals, even after the sharpest means of correction (comp. 1 Cor. v. 5) had been applied to them (I. i. 20), had yet gone completely away from the truth (II. ii. 17, 18), and a falling away even yet greater was to be feared, when once the doctrines of devils prophesied (I. iv. 1) appeared. But every sectary, who turned away all correction, thereby condemned himself as an irreclaimable sinner (Tit. iii. 10, 11). It was thus clear that all the members of the community were not elect; that there were those in the community who, by their falling away, showed themselves as *σκεύη εἰς ἀτιμίαν*.[6]

(*c*) The situation of the Pastoral Epistles brings this about, that, along with Paul, his disciples especially appear as leaders of the community, commissioned by him.[7] As such, they receive from him instructions how they are to exhort old and young men, old and young women[8] (the latter by means of older

[5] In contradistinction to the Epistles of the captivity (§ 104, *b*, footnote 4), therefore, both names occur again. It is peculiar to our Epistles that *διάβολος* usually occurs as an adjective (I. iii. 11; II. iii. 3; Tit. ii. 3: calumnious), and accordingly, also, I. iii. 6, 7, as an appellative, the calumniator, as neither *κρίμα* nor *ἐπιδισμός* permits a natural reference to the devil. According to iv. 1, the devil, by the agency of his *πνεύματα πλάνα* (*δαιμόνια*), seeks to mislead believers to make them fall away.

[6] How the original relation of these members to the community was thought of in our Epistles, and how it was explained in consequence with the Pauline idea of calling, an idea which was no longer to be held firmly in its technical sense (§ 88), on these points we find no hint.

[7] As Paul is a *δοῦλος Θεοῦ* (Tit. i. 1), so is Timothy a *δοῦλος κυρίου* (II. ii. 24; comp. Phil. i. 1; Col. iv. 12), a *διάκονος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ* (I. iv. 6; II. iv. 5; comp. Col. i. 7, iv. 7), who stands in the warfare of Christ (I. i. 18; II. ii. 3), or in the work of God (II. ii. 15). On the other hand, *ἄνθρωπος τοῦ Θεοῦ*, I. vi. 11, according to the exhortation following, and II. iii. 17, appears to designate only the Christian standing in general. But that 1 Timothy, in contradistinction from the other two Epistles, would already make valid in the person of Timothy episcopal primacy (Pfleiderer, p. 471 ff. [E. T. ii. 204]), is in no way established, especially the full powers of the disciples of the apostles are in part yet more comprehensive in the two other Epistles.

[8] Women are to be enjoined to take care that by willing subjection to their husbands, by love to husband and child, by modesty and hospitality, the word of God be not blasphemed (Tit. ii. 4, 5). Quite as, § 94, *d*, public appearances are forbidden to them as inconsistent therewith (I. ii. 11, 12), and praying in public in the church (which appears therefore to have been tied to no office) was reserved for men, who had to be in the right frame and composure for it (ver. 8). This subjection of women, however, is not only grounded on this, as § 94, *c*, that the man was first created (ver. 13), but also on this, that the woman first fell by

women; comp. note *d*), on the ground of wholesome doctrine, (Tit. ii. 1–6; I. v. 2), and equally so the different orders in the community.[9] But, above all, their task is διδασκαλία (I. iv. 13, 16, vi. 2; Tit. ii. 7; comp. II. iv. 2: διδαχή). On the ground of the χάρισμα given him (I. iv. 14; II. i. 6), Timothy has to preach the word (II. iv. 2; comp. i. 8); he does the work of an evangelist (iv. 5; comp. Eph. iv. 11). Naturally it is required throughout that the disciple follow the doctrines of the master, is guided by them in all his teaching (I. iv. 6; II. iii. 10, 14). But the most important interest of our Epistles is how doctrine is to be kept pure for the future in the Church, which is the pillar and ground of the truth (I. iii. 15). The work of teaching is no longer henceforth to continue left to the free exercise of the gifted (as § 92, *c*), but the disciples of the apostles are to look out for trustworthy men, and these they are to commission with the work of teaching, just as the apostles had commissioned their disciples with it (comp. the παραθήκη: I. vi. 20; II. i. 14), that these may be capable to bear the burden of the further development of the truth (II. ii. 2); by this attention would naturally be given to the formal talent for teaching. Further, to secure the entrance into the community of men thus commissioned with the

temptation (ver. 14; comp. moreover, 2 Cor. xi. 3). Their clothing is to be modest and simple, their ornaments to consist of good works (Tit. ii. 3; I. ii. 9, 10). Their special life-task is τεκνογονία (ver. 15), in the discharge of which, apart from their general Christian duty (ἐὰν μείνωσιν . . . σωφροσύνης), they have to pursue the completion of salvation, without seeking a circle of work beyond their sphere (comp. vv. 11, 12). When it is desired, v. 4, that the younger women should marry, bear children, and keep house, in order to escape evil repute, it is indicated, ver. 15, that cases had occurred when these were by no means without foundation, and that therefore the exhortation to marry had the same motive, as § 95, *b*. Over against such experiences generally, the high estimation of celibacy seems to have given occasion to a consideration of its dangers, and accordingly, as being according to nature, marriage had to be more strongly emphasized. The prohibition of marriage is, I. iv. 3, expressly branded as a devilish error.

[9] I. vi. 17–19 shows how the rich are to be instructed in humility and a good use of their property; Tit. ii. 9, 10, I. vi. 1, how slaves are to honour Christianity by reverence, obedience, and fidelity. Even already, notice is taken, vi. 2, of the circumstance that slaves regarded their believing masters as on a footing of equality with them as Christian brethren in a wrong way, and it is enjoined on them, quite in a Pauline sense, that they do them service all the more zealously, in a way really benefiting them (comp. Eph. vi. 7), because they are bound to them in faith and love (comp. Philem. 11–16).

office of teaching, it is required to have regard to capacity to teach in the election of bishops (I. iii. 2; comp. II. ii. 24: διδακτικός), and to prefer those presbyters who are active in teaching (I. v. 17), so that evermore the offices of teaching and guiding the church may lie on the same persons, and mutually support each other, as the right guiding of the Church can come only on the ground of pure doctrine (Tit. ii. 1). It is hence required of the bishop, that he hold firmly the faithful word in conformity with the (received) doctrine (i. 9).

(*d*) To the management of the relations of the community belongs generally the care of the right appointment of office-bearers.[10] That the elders of the congregation are those who here bear the Pauline name of ἐπίσκοποι (Phil. i. 1), is plainly proved by Tit. i. 5, 7 (comp. Acts xx. 28 with ver. 17). That a course of church development has been run is shown by this, that warnings are given against the putting neophytes into office, as these may very easily be led astray through pride by any such preference (I. iii. 6). The leaders of the church, in so far as they discharge the duties of their office by way of a calling, are allowed, and for the same reason as 1 Cor. ix., to be supported by the church (v. 17, 18). The assistants of the apostle are to exercise discipline over the presbyters, sharp but light; they are to be cautious in the choice, but unrelenting in discipline (v. 19–22). From ver. 22 it is clear that presbyters were to be ordained by the laying on of hands, as they had themselves been ordained by the laying on of the hands of the presbytery and of the

[10] At Crete (Tit. i. 5), even at the first institution of elders, just as in the church at Ephesus, which had long had her πρεσβύτεροι (Acts xx. 17), the case of a later election is already kept in view (I. iii. 1, 2). There the apostle's assistant acted quite independently on the command of the apostle; here also the directions given him as to the qualifications for office in the Church show that he had at least to manage the election of the congregation, and to guide to the right men. The qualifications for a bishop (I. iii. 2-7; Tit. i. 6-9) are, in the first place, Christian morality in general; for those elected are to have a spotless character within the church and outside it; they must also have shown that they can manage well their own house to be able to manage the Church of God. Those whose children are unbelieving, or disobedient, or lead a licentious life, are shut out from office in the church. If it is required of office-bearers that they are to be such as have been but once married (I. iii. 2, 12, v. 9; Tit. i. 6), regard is had to the stain of incontinence, which in the consciousness of the time clung to a second marriage.

apostle (iv. 14; II. i. 6).[11] In like manner, as the qualifications for the office of a bishop, are those for the office of a deacon discussed, I. iii. 8–13 (comp. § 106, *a*). In the appointment of deacons there is similarly a careful scrutiny necessary (ver. 10), in which, in particular, regard is to be had even to their wives (ver. 11), as they must in many ways assist them. Widows also belong to the officials of the church, and for their appointment directions are given (I. v. 9–16). The oversight of the female portion of the congregation seems to have been handed over to them (comp. Tit. ii. 4).[12]

§ 110. *The Church's Confession.*

The last times, during which severe dangers threaten faith and Christian morality, and even fresh trials are appointed to patience, are at hand (*a*). The Church, however, looks for the appearing of her adored divine Lord, who will execute judgment, and bring her into His heavenly kingdom (*b*). The expressions about it already assume in our Epistles the stereotyped form of the Church's confession that had sprung up from Paul's preaching (*c*). Even in their great doxologies,

[11] It follows also from both passages, that by the laying on of hands, which, according to § 41, *d*, is to be regarded as the symbol of the prayer connected therewith, the gifts which fit one for the office were really given; and this Ritschl, pp. 386, 387, seems to overlook. And this does not contradict 1 Cor. xii. 11, when, on the ground of gifts already possessed by them (comp. Acts vi. 3, and therewith § 41, *c*), they have been designated for the office by the words of prophets, to which there is reference, I. i. 18, iv. 14; and only increased capacity for the special office to be steadily executed by them is given by ordination.

[12] These widows were to be at least sixty years old, to have been married but once, to be of good report, and to be approved by good works (I. v. 9, 10). Young widows are expressly excluded, as they are in danger either to break the solemn pledge to Christ in their calling by a second marriage (vv. 11, 12), or in the unmarried state to fall again into the temptations of fleshly lusts working in them (vv. 14, 15). Even from their youth directly this position and activity may become dangerous to them (ver. 13). According to ver. 16, only those widows seem to have a right to church support who have no connections to care for them. On the contrary, what is spoken of, I. v. 3–8, is simply the appointed supporting of widows, who are the ordinary objects of church charity. And even these shall have a claim only if they are really quite alone (ὄντως χήραι), and on that account quite helpless (vv. 3, 4, 8), and also only if they are worthy of support on the part of the church, and do not trifle with it by an immoral life (vv. 5–7).

Paulinism is expressed in the liturgical form of the Church's confession (*d*).

(*a*) The Church existed even in the pre-Messianic age (Tit. ii. 12: ὁ νῦν αἰών = ὁ αἰὼν οὗτος), which bears the character of the earthly in its opposition to the divine (I. vi. 17; II. iv. 10; comp. also I. iv. 8: ἡ νῦν ζωὴ καὶ ἡ μέλλουσα). The last times (ὕστεροι καιροί) are at hand, and will bring with them, in consequence of temptation from seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils (comp. § 63, *c*), a great falling away from the faith (I. iv. 1; II. iv. 3, 4).[1] The last days will be specially severe, in which a frightful corruption of morals will gain ground, which will even hide itself under a cloak of godliness (iii. 1–5); and these days will the readers not only see, as is evident from the instructions (I. iv. 3–5) and exhortations (II. iii. 5) given them regarding these days, but their precursors are even already appearing (vv. 6–8). The hardships of the last times expected by Paul, according to § 98, *a*, assume then, conformably to the point of view of our Epistles, the form of severe imperilling of the pure faith and moral life. That, however, does not exclude the idea that bodily hardships also await the Christian. If, iii. 12, reference is made generally to the actual necessity of suffering for the Christian (comp. § 62, *b*), this suffering appears, ii. 12, quite

[1] If the doctrines of devils (I. iv. 1), which in principle forbade marriage and the use of foods (ver. 3), seem to be regarded as appearing only in the future, yet a false asceticism must have been already in the sphere of vision of our Epistles (I. iv. 8: ἡ σωματικὴ γυμνασία; comp. v. 23; Tit. i. 14: ἐντολαὶ ἀνθρώπων). If, in opposition to that, it is maintained that to the pure all things are pure (Tit. i. 15), and that everything has been given to men by God for their use (I. vi. 17; comp. iv. 3), that is exactly the fundamental principle of Christian freedom in things indifferent, as defended by Paul (comp. § 93, *c*). But above all, as it is there asserted, that everything was created good by God, and nothing is to be rejected, if only it is received with thanksgiving (iv. 3, 4). Only it may appear strange that, according to ver. 5, food is sanctified only by the word of God and prayer. But for the Christian (ver. 3), who is to be consecrated in his whole life, the question is not, therefore, whether a thing is pure and good, but whether it is consecrated, by which alone is it of the same kind with him as one consecrated. If, now, the ἔντευξις (comp. ii. 1) can be nothing else than the thanksgiving required, vv. 3, 4, by which the Christian on his part makes the food to be consecrated, then the word of God can only be the word of blessing uttered at the creation (Gen. i. 29), by which God, on His part, appointed the food for man, and hence made the use of it to be well-pleasing to Him.

as § 86, *c*, as a result of living fellowship with Christ, and so, along with *πίστις* and *ἀγάπη*, *ὑπομονή* appears as a characteristic grace of Christians (Tit. ii. 2; II. iii. 10; I. vi. 11: *πραϋπάθεια*).[2] But the harder the times were, the more firmly was the Church to grasp for herself what she expects in the future on the ground of faith (Tit. ii. 13).

(*b*) The receiver of the Epistle will presumably yet survive till the appearing of Christ, as he is to keep himself without blame to it (I. vi. 14); and he is conjured by it faithfully to discharge his office (II. iv. 1). It will follow at the time appointed of God (I. vi. 15: *καιροῖς ἰδίοις*), as did the proclamation of the salvation given at His first appearing (Tit. i. 3; I. ii. 6), and the latter is thus designated *ἐπιφάνεια* just as is His last (II. i. 10). With it comes the day of judgment (*ἡ ἐκείνη ἡμέρα*: i. 12, 18, iv. 8; comp. § 64, *b*), on which Christ, as the judge of the living and the dead (iv. 1, 8), assigns retribution (comp. i. 16, 18, iv. 14); with it also begins the heavenly kingdom of Christ (iv. 1, 18), wherefore all who dare hope to be delivered in it rejoice at His appearing (ver. 8). In the Epistles of the Imprisonment we have already seen the idea of the earlier Epistles, according to which, in the perfected kingdom of God, Christ's mediatorship ceased, disappeared (§ 103, *b*); the perfected kingdom has here already become entirely a kingdom of Christ, who, at the appearing of His glory (comp. § 98, *a*), is expressly designated as our great God and Saviour (Tit. ii. 13),—a fact which Gess, p. 230, Schenkel, p. 357, question in vain; and He is adored with a doxology (II. iv. 18), which Schenkel, p. 358, will refer to God. It is His name which the Church confesses and invokes (ii. 19, 22), which along with God (iv. 1; comp. ii. 14) and His elect angels (I. v. 21) are taken to witness. All this finds its example even in what the earlier Epistles teach of Christ's *κυριότης* (§ 76, *b*); yet the way is peculiar to our Epistles, in which, II. i. 18, ii. 19, *κύριος* is used

[2] In the Second Epistle to Timothy especially, corresponding to its situation, is the duty to suffer for the gospel expressly emphasized (i. 8, ii. 3, iv. 5), in which Paul has given an example (ii. 9, 10, iii. 11). As for magistrates, on the other hand, by whom these sufferings are as a matter of fact appointed, not only is obedience to them required (Tit. iii. 1), as in § 94, *a*, but also intercession for them, which seems even already to have been a practice of the Church, according to I. ii. 1, 2.

of God and of Christ quite close to each other (comp. I. vi. 15).[3]

(*c*) With the exception of the terms, already explained note *b*, designating the divine glory of the exalted Christ who is to appear again, one searches in vain in our Epistles for dogmatic utterances about His person. On the contrary, in the designation of His coming into the world (I. i. 15), as an Epiphany analogous to His second coming (II. i. 10), the representation of Him as a pre-existent person has found its plastic expression. Of the facts of His historical life, His resurrection and descent from the seed of David (ii. 8) are connected in a way so aphoristic and complete, and introduced with the solemn *μνημόνευε*, that this must already have been a stereotyped form, by which the Church made good her faith in the Messiahship of Jesus.[4] In the passage I. iii. 16, we

[3] In some passages, as II. ii. 7, 14, iii. 11, iv. 17, one may doubt whether *ὁ κύριος* is meant for God or Christ; but in i. 16, 18, ii. 19, 22, 24, iv. 8, 14, 18, 22, it stands quite certainly for Christ, but only in the Second Epistle to Timothy. On the other hand, He is called, I. i. 14, II. i. 8: *ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν*; I. vi. 3, 14: *ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστός*, and I. i. 2, 12, II. i. 2: *Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν*; the formula *κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός* occurs only five times in very doubtful readings. Generally, the names given to Christ show some variations from § 76, *a*; § 100, *c*, footnote 8. The simple name of Jesus has quite disappeared. *Ἰησοῦς Χριστός* is certain only in II. ii. 8, Tit. ii. 13, iii. 6, and with *ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν* it occurs in the passages above cited. The simple *ὁ Χριστός* also occurs only I. v. 11; on the contrary, *Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς* seems to be the most common. It is quite certain I. i. 15, ii. 5, iv. 6, and always (nine times) in the formula *ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ*; it may be also, in the eleven passages where the codices waver between *Ἰησοῦς Χριστός* and *Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς*, be the reading most commonly to be preferred. Here, also, the one God is opposed to Christ, not, to be sure, as the one Lord, as § 76, *c*, § 100, *c*, footnote 8, but as the Mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus (I. ii. 5), which, in fact, comes to the same thing as Christ as Lord is the Redeemer. It has to be therewith considered, that the unity of the Godhead is not made prominent in opposition to the Godhead of Christ, but to account for His uniform universal purpose of love (ver. 4, and therewith § 109, *a*).

[4] It is not, however, to be overlooked that it is just these moments by which Paul, according to Rom. i. 3, 4 (comp. § 77, *a*, *b*), proves the divine Sonship of Christ, and that the passages depend directly on the Pauline Gospel. The beautiful confession which Timothy had made before many witnesses (I. vi. 12) can scarcely have contained anything essentially different (comp. the Pauline *ὁμολογία*, Rom. x. 9; Phil. ii. 11); and when it is said, ver. 13, that Christ witnessed the same before Pontius Pilate, one must therefore think of His confession of His Messiahship (Mark xv. 2). Also this reference to a historical fact in the life of Christ occurring in solemn adjurations, points to a form already fixed, by which the Church justified her fundamental confession by an appeal to the first confessors of it.

have undoubtedly, as the unrelated beginning (read ὅς instead of Θεός), and the triple pairs of short homophonous parallel sentences show, a fragment of an old church hymn, by which the Church expresses her confession of Christ, and perhaps the ὁμολογουμένως is expressly to refer to it. Ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί, quite as the idea ἐπιφάνεια, points to a higher superhuman subject, who previously did not exist ἐν σαρκί, and just became visible in consequence of His coming ἐν σαρκί. The contrast of ἐν σαρκί and ἐν πνεύματι is most naturally explained from Rom. i. 3, 4 (§ 78, *d*), according to which, further, ἐδικαιώθη points to the justification of His claim to Messiahship given Him by the resurrection. By ὤφθη ἀγγέλοις one most naturally thinks of His entrance into the heavenly world when He appeared to the angels as the Exalted One, while He was proclaimed as such to the nations on the earth (ἐκηρύχθη ἐν ἔθνεσιν). To the faith which He found in the world (ἐπιστεύθη ἐν κόσμῳ), corresponds conversely the glorification given Him in the divine δόξα (§ 76, *d*), after He was exalted to heaven (ἀνελήφθη ἐν δόξῃ). Here, therefore, is the Church's confession, in which is embodied the sum of the mystery of salvation, as that confession grew from Pauline preaching.

(*d*) With reference to Christ as our Lord and Mediator, God, in the opening words of our Epistles, in the ordinary apostolic way (§ 77, *b*), is designated as Θεὸς πατήρ (I. i. 2; II. i. 2; Tit. i. 4). He is the living God (I. iii. 15, iv. 10; comp. § 65, *d*), and the source of all life (vi. 13; comp. Rom. iv. 17), the ἀψευδὴς Θεός (Tit. i. 2; comp. Rom. iii. 4), and the fountain of all truth (Tit. ii. 10), the blessed God (I. vi. 15), and the fountain of all blessedness (i. 11; comp. Tit. ii. 13). The great doxologies, I. i. 17, vi. 15, 16, are foreign to the Pauline methods of teaching elsewhere. God is here praised as the μόνος Θεός or δυνάστης (comp. Rom. xvi. 27: μόνῳ σοφῷ Θεῷ), as the βασιλεὺς τῶν αἰώνων or βασιλεὺς τῶν βασιλευόντων καὶ κύριος τῶν κυριευόντων, as the ἄφθαρτος (comp. Rom. i. 23), or He who alone possesses immortality, as the ἀόρατος (comp. Rom. i. 20), or as He who dwells in unapproachable light, and can hence be seen by none. While, therefore, the individual expressions correspond to Pauline statements about God, yet their doxological construction and the correspondence of the main thought in both doxologies

point to a confession of the matchless glory of God, that has come to be in permanent liturgical use in the Church. It corresponds to the whole tendency of our Epistles, as these strive to fix the apostolic doctrine, as the Church's possession, that the individual form of doctrine which has been nowhere more sharply expressed than in Paulinism, should here pass into the general form of Church confession.

PART FOURTH.

THE EARLY APOSTOLIC DOCTRINAL SYSTEM IN THE POST-PAULINE PERIOD.

INTRODUCTION.

§ 111. *The Epistle to the Hebrews.*

THE Epistle to the Hebrews demands and justifies what had become unavoidable in view of the threatened apostasy—the complete separation of the Judaeo-Christian mother Church from national and ecclesiastical fellowship with Judaism (*a*). The older conception, which ascribed it to a disciple of Paul, or saw in it the production of a phase of a later development of Paulinism, could not account for its peculiarities of teaching (*b*). The teaching of our Epistle as a more mature form of early apostolic Judaeo-Christianity in all its extent, was first set forth with full intelligence by Boehm (*c*). The Hellenistic author belongs to a tendency within Judaism, to which the most important point in the old covenant was the priestly institution for atonement, and his method of teaching is formally determined by his Alexandrian education (*d*).

(*a*) The Epistle to the Hebrews, written no doubt shortly after the middle of the seventh decade, and whose readers are certainly to be found neither in Alexandria nor in Rome, but in Palestine, and specially in Jerusalem, transplants us into the circumstances of the mother Church as she was developing after the passing away of the first generation of Christians, who had seen the Lord Himself. The apostles were already dead, or had left Jerusalem. James, the Lord's brother, had suffered a martyr's death. The Church as yet held fast to the

law of the fathers, as the first apostles had themselves done once, and as is evidently presupposed in the apostolic council (§ 43, *d*). But the consciousness of the motives which had originally justified this firm retention of it, and which even Paul had acknowledged as such (§ 87, *b*), were fading away. The longer, the more must the prizing of the legal institutions, in particular, the means of salvation given in them, lead to the depreciation and denial of those given in Christianity, especially if the supposition, on which such could alone be offered, became doubtful. But faith in the Messiahship of Jesus, which by the hope of His advent immediately at hand had for the first time removed the contradiction between the Messianic times promised by the prophets and the appearance of the Promised One in the historical present, must have become wavering, when, with the unexpectedly long delay of the advent, the hope of the commencement of the final consummation and the fulfilment of the promises grew faint. Meanwhile Zealotism within unbelieving Judaism, which was getting more hopelessly hardened, was increasing, and the persecution of the Jews who believed on Messiah was multiplying from their side. The bond of national fellowship, which was once maintained with a view to work for Israel's conversion now become without a purpose, could be maintained now only at the cost of the denial of the Christian faith, which did not appear to fulfil to its confessors the expectations raised in them. In such circumstances, there began to gain ground increasingly a critical tendency to fall away from Christianity, to a complete relapse to Judaism. Only a decided separation of the Judaeo-Christian mother Church from her former national and religious fellowship with the Jewish Church, as it had already completely taken place by the Jewish Christians in the missionary regions of Paul (comp. § 105, *d*), could prevent this threatened danger. While the Epistle to the Hebrews summons to this decisive step, it contains also an exposition of the motives which must justify and compel Jewish Christianity finally to break with its past.

(*b*) The critical dispute as to the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews has led, in the first place, to a more exact examination of its special teaching. In general, the view

remains dominant, that the Epistle was not written by the Apostle Paul himself, but by one of his disciples. From this point of view, one is content partly to point out the essential points of agreement in the method of its teaching with the Pauline, and partly to note some contrasted peculiarities. In this mind Neander deals with our Epistle in the Appendix to his exposition of the Pauline doctrine (pp. 838–858 [E. T. ii. 1–14, Bohn's translation]); so do Schmidt, only more briefly (ii. pp. 356–359 [E. T. 513–518]), and Lechler (pp. 159–163), and van Oosterzee (§ 43). Lutterbeck (pp. 245–251) has, in a way somewhat more thorough, presented from our Epistle the teaching of Apollos as that of a strong follower of Paul (comp. lately Hilgenfeld in his *Zeitschrift*, 1872, 1). Messner has in the most thorough and comprehensive way from this standpoint treated of the teaching of the Epistle to the Hebrews, who, to be sure, acknowledges a certain affinity with Petrine teaching (comp. p. 57), but he yet ascribes the Epistle to a disciple of Paul. A further step was taken by the Tübingen school, who ascribed our Epistle to a later phase of development of Paulinism, by which it seeks to set forth Christianity as the true Judaism (comp. Köstlin in his *Joh. Lehrbegriff*, II. i. 4, pp. 387–472), or to harmonize Paulinism with Judaism by the passing over of the latter to the former (comp. Schwegler, ii. pp. 304–325), or to make it acceptable to Judaism by the rejection of all that is offensive in it (Schenkel, § 26, 27). Reuss (ii. pp. 265–290 [E. T. ii. 238–261]) similarly regards it as the first production of the theology of transition from Paulinism to the Johannean; and Baur, in his *Lehrbegriff* (pp. 230–256), seeks to show it to be the first step towards removing the antithesis between Paulinism and the Judaism of the Apocalypse, by which he throws the ambiguity of his interpretation of it on the author himself (p. 248). The latest productions of Pfleiderer (pp. 324–366 [E. T. 51–95]) and Immer (pp. 399–421) see in it a Paulinism coloured by Alexandrian influences. But so long as one starts from Paulinism for a full comprehension of the teaching of our Epistle, one cannot thoroughly account for its peculiarities.

(*c*) David Schulz had already in his commentary (*Der Brief an die Hebräer*, Breslau 1818) declared the general

view of our Epistle to be essentially distinct from the Pauline, and to be throughout Jewish; but he found, as it could not be otherwise with his one-sided exaggeration of this view, only contradiction (comp. De Wette, *über die symbolisch-typische Lehrart des Br. a. d. Heb., in der theologischen Zeitschrift von Schleiermacher, De Wette, und Lücke*, 1822, 3, pp. 1–51). For the first time, in consequence of the movement set agoing by the Tübingen school, was the central thought of it again taken up by Plank (*Judenthum und Urchristenthum, in den theologischen Jahrbüchern*, 1847, 2, 3, 4), who regarded our Epistle as a complete counterpart, proceeding from Jewish Christianity, to the Pauline view. Köstlin also (*in den theologischen Jahrbüchern*, 1853, 1854) modified his opinion (comp. note *b*), in the direction that the Epistle does not represent the Pauline school, but the general apostolic Christianity, influenced no doubt by Paul, and that it represents a Jewish Christianity spiritually transformed by the impulse of Paulinism. More accurately, Ritschl designated the form of doctrine in our Epistle as a stage in the later development of the early apostolic form of doctrine, by which he, moreover, narrowed the influence of Paulinism on the Christology (pp. 159–171). This correct conception of our Epistle lies at the basis of the thorough and luminous exhibition of its teaching by Riehm (*der Lehrbegriff des Hebräerbriefs*, Ludwigsburg, 1858, 1859, 2 Ausg. 1867; comp. especially pp. 861–863), only that he estimates somewhat higher the influence of Paulinism (p. 865 sq.). Biblical theology has not to answer the difficult historical question, how far the peculiarities of doctrine demand or justify the assumption of an influence of Paul upon the author; it has only to verify its coincidences with Paulinism, which yet in no way by themselves justify the conclusion of a direct or indirect influence of Paul. It has, however, to start from the fact, overwhelmingly established from every side by Riehm, that the roots of the views of doctrine of our Epistle lie, in the early apostolic Jewish Christianity, in its difference from Paulinism; and this assumption, on the ground of which we range the discussion of our Epistle in this place, will be most clearly confirmed to us in the exhibition of its doctrine throughout; comp. moreover, Kluge, *der Hebräerbrief, Auslegung und Lehrbegriff*, Neuruppin 1863.

(*d*) The author of our Epistle is, according to ii. 3, a disciple of the first apostles. Although not a native of Palestine, but a Hellenist, as his pure and select Greek diction shows, he must yet have continued a considerable time in the mother Church, and exercised a preponderating activity in it. If the peculiar conception of Judaism, which looks on it pre-eminently as the typical, yet in itself the imperfect institute of salvation, is conditioned by the special theme of our Epistle, it yet coalesces with the peculiarities of the author's doctrine in all directions, that he, even before his conversion, must have already belonged to some tendency of Judaism, which put the main stress neither on the fulfilment of the law, as James (§ 37, *b*), nor on the fulfilment of prophecy, as Peter (§ 36, *b*), but upon the salvation given in the Old Covenant; and this not in the exact fulfilment of the law, as Paul the Pharisee (§ 58, *b*) thought, but in the priesthood, and in the atonement mediated thereby. How far to our author the insufficiency or the typical character of the Old Testament saving institute had been already given up by the influence of prophecy, it is not possible to say. But he could, at any rate, after he had found in Jesus the Messiah, and with Him the perfect salvation promised to his people, reach certainty about this only by a comparison of the atonement offered in Christianity with that of the Old Testament. Our author further, like Paul, is no novice in respect to theology; but he has not been educated in the school of Pharisaic-rabbinic learning, as the former (§ 58, *a*), but in a school in which the spirit of Alexandrianism had the ascendency. Yet this culture seems to leave influenced rather the formal side of his method of doctrine.[1] The question who this author is, does not further interest biblical theo-

[1] The Alexandrian culture of the author has, since Grotius, been admitted by most, but it has often been driven to one-sided exaggeration (comp. Baumgarten-Crusius, p. 90, who will have it that all the main thoughts of the Epistle have been borrowed therefrom). But even Neander has shown how completely distinct is the spirit of our Epistle from Alexandrian speculation, and Riehm has convincingly proved that nothing specifically from Philo can be shown in it. But the Alexandrian school in general, to which the author owed his education, must have been ruled rather by the spirit of the Old Testament than by Hellenic philosophy, and must have more really preserved the spiritual connection with Palestinian Judaism, than the peculiarly Alexandrian Gnosis

logy, yet it ought to be noticed that only the supposition of Barnabas being the author has any real traditional basis, and can explain the peculiarities of our Epistle in all directions.

§ 112. *The Second Epistle of Peter and the Epistle of Jude.*

The second monument of this epoch, and quite irrespective of its genuineness, is the so-called Second Epistle of Peter, which in its doctrinal method is in any case very nearly allied to the first, but belongs to the post-Pauline period (*a*). The rise of Libertinism in principle, as also the commencement of complaints as to the delay of the advent, form the historical background for the exhortations of the Epistle (*b*). How little the former expositions have hit the speciality of its doctrinal method is clear from this, that Alexandrianism has been suspected in it (*c*). As the Epistle is connected in its main section in the closest way with the Epistle of Jude, which was directed against the first emergence of that Libertinism, it seems suitable to treat of the latter along with it (*d*).

(*a*) The question of the genuineness of the Second Epistle, handed down to us under the name of Peter, is not, as sometimes happens, to be regarded as yet settled (comp. Weiss, *die Petrinische Frage* II. *in den theologischen Studien und Kritiken*, 1866, 2). If it is genuine, its origin falls shortly after the middle of the seventh decade, and then it is an undoubted monument of this epoch. But if it is not genuine, it must be regarded as such. Its whole doctrinal method is specifically Judaeo-Christian, moving in Old Testament images, histories, and ideas, and it exhibits in all its fundamental lines so manifold affinities with the First Epistle of Peter (comp. the work above, pp. 286–294), that we can imagine the author to

(p. 864). The ingenious attempt by Pfleiderer to explain the teaching of the Epistle from the specifically Philonian view of the contrast between the invisible imperishable archetypal world, and the visible perishable actual world of sense (pp. 325–332 [E. T. ii. 51–60]; comp. Lipsius, § 591, 704, 738), seems to me to mix up together the two quite distinct orders of ideas of the heavenly dwelling of God, as the archetypal holy place, and of the heaven of perfected salvation, already present (*i.e.* in the divine purpose), and ideally present to Christian hope, which do not throughout need any such explanation; and the assertion that the essential superiority of Christianity is traced back in it to that metaphysical opposition, seems to me to have not been quite established.

have proceeded only from the circle of the first apostles. On the other hand, the Epistle is addressed to the essentially Gentile churches of Asia Minor (i. 1; comp. iii. 1), that had been formed by the Pauline activity; he is aware of the Pauline Epistles (iii. 15, 16), and even the Epistles of the Imprisonment sent to Asia Minor; there are perhaps to be found even traces of the doctrinal language of the Pastoral Epistles. Our Epistle therefore belongs to the monuments of the form of doctrine of the first apostles from the post-Pauline period, even though it is difficult to show any traces of what is specially Pauline in it.

(*b*) The Second Epistle is hortative, as is the first; but if the position of Christians in the midst of the unbelieving world gave occasion to the exhortation of the latter (§ 36, *a*), the exhortation of the former is caused by the special dangers which threatened the inner life of the Church. That great corruption of morals, which the Pastoral Epistles prophesied for the last times (§ 110, *a*), we see here already in part begun. But the most dangerous thing was, that it excused itself for the fundamental principles of Libertinism, which ought to be a consequence of true Christian liberty, and were based on an appeal to misunderstood and misapplied words of Paul and other passages of the Bible. But it was to be expected that this Libertinism would ever more acquire for itself a yet more comprehensive basis, and so would shape itself into a false doctrine, dangerous to the soul. The more our author now borrows for his exhortation, as Peter does (§ 51, *d*), motives from the doctrine of Christian hope, the more dangerous was it if the foundations of Christian hope itself began to get unsteady. But even already, the delay in the fulfilment of this hope began at that time to be spoken of in the Church in a tone of complaint or of fault-finding (comp. § 111, *a*), and it was to be expected, that if that whole generation, within which the advent of the Parousia had been confidently expected, should really die out before it came, the frivolous doubt would deny any possibility of its fulfilment, and thus the fundamental grounds for striving after Christian virtue would be undermined. It is this historical situation which gives its special colouring to the exhortation of our Epistle, and conditions its whole contents and compass.

(*c*) Schmid (ii. pp. 212–217 [E. T. 413–416]) treats of the doctrines of our Epistle in the appendix to his representation of the Petrine doctrinal system, while he brings forward many right, but in no respect exhaustive, considerations as to the connection of the two; and in consequence of a mistaken conception of the ἐπίγνωσις emphasized in it, he ascribes to the Epistle an Alexandrian colouring, which must stamp it as intermediate between the Petrine and the Johannean systems. While Lechler (p. 191 f.) and Lutterbeck (pp. 179–182) do not go beyond a few unimportant remarks, which give a result unfavourable to its authenticity, Messner (pp. 154–170) has dealt with the doctrinal system of our Epistle in the sense of Schmid in the greatest detail; while, on the other hand, van Oosterzee, p. 30, has mainly sought to prove the relationship of its doctrinal system with that of First Peter. On the side of the Tübingen school, Schwegler (ii. pp. 495–517) has enrolled our Epistle in the history of the development of the Roman Church, and reckoned it along with the pretended Gospel of Mark recommended by him, and the Clementine Recognitions, which represent the complete conclusion of peace. He declares its dogmatic character to be Petrine, and finds Philo's writings to be diligently used in it, although, to be sure, the proof for this adduced by him cannot prove anything (comp. Immer, p. 493 f.). Baur, on the other hand, only asserts that Christianity is conceived of in it theoretically as ἐπίγνωσις, practically as ἀγάπη or ἀρετή, and thus Paulinism and Jewish Christianity were united, in which was shown the tendency of the doctrinal system of the Catholic Church as it was being shaped (p. 297).

(*d*) The Epistle of Jude, written apparently about the middle of the sixth decade, comes from the brother of James, whom we, § 37, put among the representatives of the early apostolic type of doctrine. It is very natural, on this account, to connect his doctrine with that of this James, and by this Schmid (ii. pp. 140–150 [E. T. 368–374]) and Messner (pp. 99–107) have allowed themselves, in fact, to be misled. In his doctrine of the judgment he is to present a sidepiece to the doctrine of James about the law. But our Epistle neither contains any special doctrine of the judgment, which naturally is spoken of only in his threats against those libertines he is

contending with (whom both regard, but mistakenly, as special false teachers), nor does he show elsewhere any affinity to the Epistle of James beyond the common fundamental principles of Jewish Christianity. Since, now, the Second Epistle of Peter was not only acquainted with the Epistle of Jude, but in its polemic against the libertines (note *b*) is in great part in harmony with it, their spiritual affinity is thereby established on both sides. In this Epistle there are shown, to be sure, although its method of teaching is rooted in the Old Testament, hints even of the Pauline method in contradistinction from the Epistles of Peter. Yet we shall ever have a right to reckon the otherwise small results, which the Epistle of Jude furnishes to biblical theology, incidentally with the representation of doctrine of the Second Epistle of Peter (comp. Immer, p. 491). Lechler (p. 170 f.) and Lutterbeck (p. 176 f.) have contented themselves with establishing its Jewish-Christian character in general. Reuss has, by the way, made use of both our Epistles as sources for Jewish-Christian theology (i. book iv.). Van Oosterzee has included the Epistle of Jude, § 31, among the doctrinal systems allied to the Petrine. Schwegler has dealt with it only by way of appendix (i. pp. 518–522), in order to prove a tendency to recommend the apostolic tradition, which would be put strangely enough in the mouth of an unknown individual, for whom only the claim was made for the honour to be the brother of the honoured head of the Jewish Christians.

§ 113. *The Johannean Apocalypse.*

The third monument of this period, in which the inner dangers and the external troubles required a re-quickening of the flagging hope in the nearness of the Parousia, is the Apocalypse (*a*). This comes apparently from the Apostle John; but it must in any case be considered, without reference to the other Johannean writings, as a witness of the early apostolic Jewish Christianity of this period (*b*). The prophetic character of the book renders it more difficult to estimate its biblical theological value, but it does not lessen that value (*c*). In the former conceptions of its method of

doctrine, the question above all else has been discussed, whether any antithesis to Paulinism is uttered in it (*d*).

(*a*) At the beginning of the seventh decade stands in any case the sole prophetic writing of the New Testament, though the historical references of the Apocalypse may point to the year 68, or more correctly the year 70. In it once again, to the doubts and anxieties on account of the delay of the Parousia, which emerged at this time (§ 111, *a*; 112, *b*), there was opposed the most energetic announcement of its immediate nearness. The author in a series of visions has in part received the assurance that it is at hand; he partly sees in striking images itself, its foretokens, and the process of the final consummation beginning with it. He even undertakes to point out the signs of the time after the method of the Jewish Apocalypse, and to indicate within his historical field of vision its milestones, by which one may count the steps which the development of the last times must take till the final catastrophe. Everything, moreover, in this period recalls it. In the Church, Christian life has sunk low, and heathenish Libertinism misleads her by its false prophecy, which professes to be deep wisdom (comp. § 112, *b*, *d*). Persecutions by Jews and Christians have affected the Church, but above all is the horror of the time of Nero, which furnished the author with the image, ever before his eyes, of the capital city of the world drunk with the blood of the martyrs. As in the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Second Epistle of Peter, so here too the proclamation of the Parousia is at the same time a powerful call to repentance, as also a powerful declaration of comfort.

(*b*) The oldest tradition, which begins indeed with Justin, ascribes the Apocalypse, quite unanimously, even thus early to the Apostle John. The doubts which emerged later in the church of Alexandria, and made the canonical validity of the Apocalypse a matter of contention for long in the East, spring, one strongly suspects, from a dislike of the contents of the book. The glowing phantasy, and the flaming indignation towards the enemies of the kingdom of God, which characterize the book, correspond to the image of the son of thunder, which the earlier Gospels show us; and there can be no doubt that the fundamental type of his doctrinal views

is that of the early apostolic Jewish-Christian Church. And hence the Tübingen school have rightly blamed for one-sidedness the later criticism, which, in the dilemma to ascribe either the Apocalypse or the Gospel and the Epistles to the Apostle John, decides without further trouble for the latter. That dilemma, however, to which they firmly adhere, is yet by no means proved by the evidence (comp. Hase, *die Tübinger Schule*, Leipzig 1855, pp. 20–30). Biblical theology has as little to settle the justification for that theory as it has to settle the question of authenticity; it has to present the doctrines of the Apocalypse as those of a monument of the early apostolic Jewish Christianity, as these took shape in this post-Pauline epoch; and it has, on the other hand, only to take care that the reference to the doctrinal method in writings, in any case so diverse and so much later, which bear the name of John, does not prejudice a fair appreciation of the peculiar character of our book.

(*c*) Corresponding to the special task of our book, the doctrine of Christian hope stands in the forefront of its view of doctrine; yet it presents in several other ways the peculiarity of the doctrinal method of the author, since the exhortation running through it refers in many ways to his conception of the Christian salvation, and to the moral motives involved in it. The greatest difficulty in the way of the biblical theological treatment of the book lies in this, that, in conformity with the whole plan of the book, many views full of significance are presented only in images, whose interpretation is not easy, and often it is difficult to show in them with certainty the limits of what is competent to a learned interpretation, and what belongs only to the poetic colouring. The prophetic character of the book, on the other hand, can in no wise diminish its biblical theological value. As surely as visions lie at the basis of the representation of the book,—visions which were to the author the bearers of a divine revelation,—so certainly are the seven visions of our book, which are artificially presented, executed in colours evidently borrowed from the study of Old Testament prophecy and our Jewish apocalyptical writings, and advance in systematic order (comp. my *Recension von Düsterdieck's Commentar in dem theologischen Literaturblatt von* 1860, Nos. 1, 2), a free

literary reproduction of what was given the author to behold on the ground of their revelations of the future. Like every other doctrinal writing of the New Testament, it can, on that account, but reproduce the God-given contents with the stamp of an individual, which shows the special doctrinal view of the author.

(*d*) By Schmid and Lutterbeck the Apocalypse is drawn on, only incidentally, with a view to a comparison with the representation of the Johannean doctrinal system; Lechler, while he too assumes its apostolicity, has first presented its doctrinal system independently (pp. 199–205), and then compared it with the Johannean (pp. 228–232; comp. van Oosterzee, § 49). Messner, on the other hand, who does not hold it to be apostolic (p. 363), has set forth with tolerable fulness its doctrinal system as the last (pp. 365–381), but he has in this confined himself almost entirely to the eschatology and the Christology. The Tübingen school has been the first to set up a more thorough investigation into the whole theological character of our book, and to that school it was the only monument of early apostolic Jewish Christianity of any consequence (comp. Köstlin in his *Joh. Lehrbegriff* (pp. 482–500). Only a writing which in any case arose before the Pauline period must not be used, with Reuss (i. 4), as a source for the oldest Jewish-Christian theology. Naturally, the Tübingen school finds in it an emphatic antithesis to Paulinism; but however often that may be asserted (comp. yet Immer, pp. 163–169), as little yet are the otherwise very diverse attempts by Baur (pp. 207–230; comp. on the other hand, Ritschl, pp. 120–122) and Schenkel (§ 21) to prove it to be considered successful. The independent representation of the *Lehrbegriff der Apocalypse* by H. Gebhardt (Gotha 1873 [translated into English, T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1878]) rests mainly on the proof of the identity of the author with that of the other Johannean writings (comp. my "Recens." in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1874, p. 582 ff.).

§ 114. *The Historical Books.*

The latest of the documents belonging to this class are the synoptical Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles (*a*). Their

origin is also conditioned, to be sure, by the circumstances of the time, by which the apparent delay of the Parousia threatened to weaken the faith in the Messiahship of Jesus, and in the fulfilment of the promise (*b*). Their biblical theological value is conditioned by a critical decision as to the literary use of sources and traditional matter made use of, a decision which may and ought to be carried to some sure stage (*c*). Former labourers here offer little help for the execution of our task, because they either ignore the critical question, or else settle it in a falsely one-sided way (*d*).

(*a*) There can be no doubt that the first two Gospels, which bear the name of Matthew and Mark, are to be looked upon as witnesses for early apostolic Jewish Christianity. Not only are their authors acknowledged to have been Jewish Christians, but the Gospel of Mark rests on a Petrine tradition; the so-called Gospel of Matthew on a written tradition of the Apostle Matthew (comp. § 11, *a*, *b*). If with these we at the same time include the Gospel of Luke, and its continuation, the so-called Acts of the Apostles, although their author was without doubt a Gentile Christian and a follower of Paul, then would even that find its justification in the affinity of the former with the two other synoptical Gospels. But this affinity rests even on this, that the Gospel of Mark and the early apostolic sources of the first Gospel must have lain at the basis of the writing of the Gospel, as also were other early apostolic sources made use of either directly or indirectly (§ 11, *c*), while similar sources must, according to § 35, *b*, have been at the basis especially of the first part of the Acts of the Apostles. But a writer who made such abundant use of early apostolic sources, in spite of his dependence on Paul, could not be regarded as a representative of pure Paulinism. Early apostolic and Pauline elements must have become mixed in his doctrinal view, and his writings would be distinguished from the other documents mentioned in this section only in this way, that there is here undoubtedly a more direct influence of Paulinism; and that, even though such is to be assumed in them, it here forms not the woof, but the warp of the web of his doctrinal views.

(*b*) Our synoptical Gospels arose partly before and partly after the year 70, the Acts of the Apostles a little later;

they belong therefore chronologically to this period. It is also very likely that the rise of our Gospel literature is closely connected with the circumstances of the time. The more that the most decisive evidence for Jesus' Messiahship seemed to be brought into doubt by the apparent delay of the Parousia (§ 111, *a*; 112, *b*; 113, *a*), all the more must the regard of the Church have been turned back to the historical life of Jesus, and in it must have sought for those moments which, even irrespective of His glorious return, set forth securely the Messianic character of His appearance. A representation, moreover, of Jesus' life could not be given without reviving the hope of His speedy return by the production of His prophecy of the Parousia. If the first two evangelists have set before themselves specially this task, this is presented from another side by the Pauline Luke. We have seen, § 90, 91, how it was that Paul reconciled the apparent contradiction of the history of Christianity, which found its richest and most significant development on Gentile-Christian ground, with the promise given to Israel, with which the earliest form of the hope of the Messianic final consummation was connected (§ 42, *a*). As, now, with the fall of Jerusalem the temporary rejection of Israel had become decisive, this apparent contradiction must have become glaringly prominent; and it was natural to seek in the life of Jesus, and in the history of the apostles, those moments which set forth the transference of Christianity from the Jews to the Gentiles as a transference ordained of God. Regarded from this side, the writings of Luke, which assumed this task expressly, must have helped to strengthen the certainty of the Messianic salvation, in spite of the unexpected form of its development, and thereby to meet any doubt as to its hoped-for consummation. But the first Gospel also had apparently already canvassed this task, and, so far as it was possible in a narrative of the life of Jesus, had sought to solve it.

(*c*) The biblical theological value of the historical writings depends in no respect on the idea ruling in the Tübingen school, according to which the oldest church had not in them the viewpoint of original historical documents, but, as they had sprung from the dogmatic consciousness of the time,

conformably to this they modified them ever afresh (comp. Schwegler, i. p. 258). Even if the traditionary matter used in them was essentially historical, and was regarded as such, yet even from the selection and grouping of the materials, as well as from the individual literary reflections on these, the point of view could in several ways be recognised from which the author regarded it. So far as we can now trace the use made of the sources by the authors, it is added that in their motives for deviating from the sources, where these can be established, are exhibited the conceptions and views peculiar to them.[1] The matter is more difficult when we are in a position to ascertain nothing reliable as to the sources, whether verbal or written, from which the first or third evangelist has drawn. Then nothing else remains but to regard the facts, reflections, or sayings of Jesus, contained in these portions in the form and conception in which they are received by the individual evangelist, as their special spiritual possession, and as a moment for the determination of their doctrinal view, where it does not somehow lie in the nature of the case that the statements taken from their sources refer to the views of an earlier period, as does much in the preliminary history of Luke.[2] In this relation the treatment of the Acts of the Apostles presents the greatest difficulty, where cautious criticism cannot think of a detailed

[1] This is least of all possible with Mark, when, not to speak of the very free use of single passages from the apostolic sources, the dividing line is not to be drawn with any certainty throughout between what the author took from (Petrine) tradition by word of mouth, and what he contributed from his own conception. On the other hand, the work of Mark can be perfectly traced in our first and third Gospels, and also the use made of apostolic sources, where these have been used independently by both. From the analogy of the doctrinal peculiarities thus gotten on the one hand, and the character of the apostolic sources on the other hand, further conclusions can then be drawn of what has been altered or added by one of the two only of what was drawn from apostolic sources (§ 11, *d*).

[2] The historical question, whether trustworthy traditions from the life and the lips of Jesus are herein contained, or whether only the ideas of the Church, by means of the authors regarding Jesus and the utterance of what they looked upon as the opinion or the command of Christ have been therein embodied, does not come within the sphere of biblical theology. For it only the facts and utterances of Jesus, as recorded by the Gospels, or by one of them, are established by means of the evangelists, as existing in the consciousness of the Church at the time when the Gospels arose, and as regulation for her doctrinal development.

separation, carried through the whole book, of the accounts taken from the sources, or directly from eye and ear witnesses, and of what has been added by Luke (comp. § 35, *b*).[3] Yet not only does the plan and the doctrinal tendency of the Acts of the Apostles remain full of significance, but enough is to be found throughout the whole book, which, as the representation of the writer, may be referred directly to his views. There is much, to be sure, which now seems to be a peculiarity of Luke's conception, which belonged originally to his sources; but inasmuch as he has appropriated them in the way before us, they may yet be looked on as his spiritual property.

(*d*) It helps little to the solution of our task when Schmid and Lechler compare the Gospel of Matthew with the Epistle of James (comp. Schmid, ii. pp. 133–139 [E. T. 363–368]; Lechler, p. 171); van Oosterzee, Mark and Matthew with Jude (§ 31); all three, the writings of Luke with Paulinism (comp. Schmid, pp. 355–366 [E. T. 513–518]; Lechler, pp. 156–158; van Oosterzee, p. 211); and the first of them compare the two Jewish-Christian Gospels with the doctrinal system of Peter (ii. p. 211 ff. [E. T. 412]). Lutterbeck deals very thoroughly with the doctrine of the Gospel of Matthew, as the first stage of the doctrinal system of Peter (pp. 158–169); that of the Gospel of Mark, in common with the Epistles of Peter, as the third stage of it (pp. 182–184), in a way which corresponds neither with the trustworthiness of the Gospels nor with the originality of Mark. He is more cautious in the section about the doctrines of Luke discussed in the Gospel and the Acts of the Apostles (pp. 238–244). In complete conformity with his system, Baur, pp. 297–338, has represented the doctrinal system of the synoptical Gospels, and of the Acts of the Apostles, as the fourth stage in the second period, according to which they are treated as purely doctrinal writings, which have quite freely invented

[3] For the representation of the earliest apostolic preaching, and for the religious life of the early Church, we have made use of this especially in its first portion, and similarly of many a part in the later sections for the illustration of Pauline doctrine and of life in the Pauline churches. But as even in the first part much can be distinguished from the tradition made use of as belonging to the peculiar conception of Luke, so also the later sections can be variously used, in order, from the way in which Luke reproduces the words of his apostle, to find out his conception of Paulinism.

their materials in conformity with their doctrinal tendency, or have changed them. In complete opposition to this, Reuss, in his handling of the three Gospels (ii. pp. 344–366 [E. T. ii. 311–339]), has occupied himself mainly with the proof, that the supposed theological party points are not indicated in our writings, and that they cannot be put under the point of view of doctrinal writings with a tendency, unless they are to be convicted of self-contradiction.

SECTION I.

THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

CHAPTER I.

THE OLD AND THE NEW COVENANT.

Comp. van den Ham, *Doctrina de veteri novoque testamento in ep. ad Hebræos exhibita*, 1847.

§ 115. *The Imperfection of the Old Covenant.*

The Epistle to the Hebrews presents the relation of Judaism and Christianity under the aspect of a New Covenant which is to bring the promise given in the Old to fulfilment (*a*). Such fulfilment was dependent on the fulfilment of the law, and that even by the pious of the Old Covenant remained very imperfect (*b*). To meet this want, to be sure, there was given the atoning institute of the Old Covenant, which was to bring about for the members of the covenant the perfection necessary for obtaining the fulfilment of the covenant promise, but it had proved to be defective and unreal (*c*). It could only have this one object, prefiguratively to set forth as a typical prophecy the perfect atonement of the New Covenant (*d*).

(*a*) What Christ proclaimed as the coming of the kingdom of God (§ 13, *c*), what the early apostles as the appearance of

the Messianic last times, and the perfecting of the theocracy begun (§ 40, *a*; 44, *a*), what Paul as the fulness of time and the beginning of the economy of grace (§ 75, *a*, *b*), that the Epistle to the Hebrews so designates, that the first covenant (viii. 7, 13, ix. 15) has given place to the covenant recently made (*νέα*: xii. 24), which as to its nature is new (*καινή*: ix. 15), and as to its continuance is eternal (xiii. 20).[1] The object of this covenant is at last to bring to actual fulfilment the promise which the Old Covenant was meant to fulfil and could not. The author points out in particular that the promised rest of God, which could not be given to the people of the Old Covenant, is to be looked for now in the New Covenant (iii. 7–iv. 10), and that all the righteous of the Old Covenant, even though they may have received the fulfilment of single promises (vi. 15, xi. 33), yet have not obtained the promise absolutely, *i.e.* the covenant promise (xi. 39), because, along with the members of the New Covenant, they were to attain to the perfection (ver. 40) which the Old Covenant could not give, and which alone could qualify them for it. We have therefore in the Gospel, which presents to our view the fulfilment of the promise, received the same glad tidings as the people of the Old Covenant (iv. 2, 6); and the aim of the New Covenant is the reception of the covenant promise of the Old Covenant (ix. 15, x. 36), whose fulfilment it can bring about, because it alone realizes the conditions thereto. But this promise was not first given when the Sinaitic covenant was set up;[2] but this is already the first

[1] This view is based on the prophecy in Jer. xxxi. 31 sq. (viii. 8, x. 16), which Paul also quotes (Rom. xi. 27) without making more of it; it is also referred to by Christ in the words of the institution of the Supper (Mark xiv. 24; comp. § 22, *c*), and it appears in a significant passage in Peter (i. 2; § 49, *c*). The covenant is a contract between God and His people; but, in conformity with the relation between the two parties, the making of the covenant is from God alone (viii. 9, 10). He it is who has given the covenant to His people, for the fulfilment of which He binds Himself by entering into covenant; the covenant and the promise are correlative ideas (ix. 15). But the fact is now evident that this promise has not been fulfilled in the Old Covenant, and hence the need of a New Covenant which can actually realize it.

[2] As Paul already dates the promise from the time of Abraham (§ 72, *d*), so here also the Abrahamic promise is the basis of the Christian hope (vi. 13–18), on which account Abraham has in his eye the same goal of hope as the Christian (xi. 10, 13–16). Hence one cannot say, with Riehm, p. 232, that with Paul the promise was given before the law, but, with our author, after it; for the passage

step towards the realization of it among the people, who certainly had not reached and could not reach the goal.

(*b*) To make the people acceptable to God, and thereby capable of receiving the covenant promise, there was given them at the making of the covenant at Sinai the law, and this, to be sure, according to the teaching of the Palestinian Jews (comp. § 42, *d*; 71, *c*), by the mediation of angels (ii. 2: ὁ δι' ἀγγέλων λαληθεὶς λόγος); and this law of Moses (x. 28) was before the ratification of the covenant solemnly read by him in the presence of all, that they might now on their part bind themselves to its fulfilment (ix. 19; Ex. xxiv. 7). The awful severity of holy obligation which the Jews took upon themselves in entering the Old Covenant is indicated by the author, xii. 18–21, by the terrible appearances which accompanied the giving of the law at Sinai.[3] Every transgression of this law was a breach of the covenant, which released God from His obligation towards the people, and rendered the fulfilment of the covenant promise impossible.[4] But now, under the Old Covenant, transgressions were constantly occur-

vii. 28 does not refer to the covenant promise, but to the promise of a new priesthood, which should bring about the realization of the covenant promise. Certainly the declarations of the early apostles are in accordance with the thought that the patriarchal promise refers to the final goal looked for by the Christian Church (§ 43, *a*).

[3] The law, as it belongs to the very essence of the covenant, cannot naturally be awanting in the new, but it is now written on the heart of the people, according to the promise of Jeremiah, xxxi. 33 (viii. 10, x. 16). From this latter view James also starts (§ 52, *b*), and it lies in a turn, directed, to be sure, against the law, at the basis of the Pauline doctrine, according to which the New Covenant is a spiritual covenant in opposition to the covenant of the law (§ 87, *a*). But the thought suggested by that prophecy to the author, that the defectiveness of the Old Covenant lay in the law's not being yet written on the heart, is carried no farther in our Epistle; and hence it must not be brought forward, as by Riehm, p. 101, as a characteristic of the difference between the Old and New Covenants as taught in it. For the same reason also the difference between the Old and New Covenants, expressed by the Pauline contrasts of letter and spirit, of bondage and freedom, are equally foreign to our Epistle, even though the latter occurs, but in a different application, in early apostolic preaching (§ 49, *d*; 52, *b*).

[4] Also with Paul, law-giving belongs to the essence of the Old Covenant, so much so that, 2 Cor. iii. 14, the reading of the law is the reading of the Old Covenant. The Old Covenant is designated, Gal. iv. 24, a covenant of bondage. But he distinguishes between the legal covenant, made with the nation at Sinai, and the covenants of promise made with the fathers (Rom. ix. 4; Eph. ii. 12). As he regards the latter as pure acts of grace, which attached no condition to

ring (ix. 15: *αἱ ἐπὶ τῇ πρώτῃ διαθήκῃ παραβάσεις*), and even because the fathers continued not in the Old Covenant (by fulfilling the law), God must promise a New Covenant, if He would yet fulfil the covenant promise (viii. 9, after Jer. xxxi. 32). No doubt our Epistle clearly distinguishes between sins of weakness and ignorance on the one hand (*ἀσθένεια*: v. 2, vii. 28; comp. iv. 15; *ἀγνοήματα*: ix. 7, v. 2), as all the righteous even commit them,[5] and transgression on the other, arising from intentional despising of the law (x. 28) and wilful disobedience, which in the Old Covenant incurred righteous retribution, because the threatening must remain *βέβαιος* (ii. 2; comp. x. 28); like as the generation which followed Moses out of Egypt, on account of stiff-necked disobedience, had to perish in the wilderness, and must not come to the promised rest (iii. 15–19).[6] Only these deadly sins, therefore, involve a breach of the covenant in the fullest sense, and every one who commits them remains shut out for ever from the fulfilment of the covenant promise. But each transgression of the law hinders the completion of the covenant

the promise, so the law could as little annul the promise as the unfaithfulness of men could annul the faithfulness of God, which guaranteed the fulfilment of the promise to the posterity of the fathers (§ 72, *d*).

[5] There were, it is true, *δίκαιοι* even in the Old Covenant (comp. xi. 4, x. 38); but they, too, according to xii. 23 (comp. xi. 40), needed yet *τελείωσις*. Their *δικαιοσύνη* (xi. 33), just like that of those who were not under the law (xi. 4, 7, vii. 2), cannot therefore be regarded as a perfect fulfilment of the law, or as absolute moral perfection. It is rather, x. 22, presupposed that all the members of the Old Covenant had an evil conscience, *i.e.* a conscience of sins committed (ver. 2), in consequence of which they needed cleansing and perfecting (ix. 14, 9). The *συνείδησις* here, just as with Paul, is not men's consciousness as to their relation to God, as Riehm, p. 676, defines it, but their consciousness as to the moral qualities of their actions and dispositions (xiii. 18); and that, no doubt, is determined according to the divine law. The Epistle to the Hebrews, on the contrary, in reference to *δικαιοσύνη*, follows the mode of speech of the first apostles, in contradistinction to that of Paul (comp. § 65, *b*).

[6] Corresponding to this, the sinful acts of pre-Christian times, so far as they belong to that category, are designated, just as by Peter (§ 44, *c*, footnote 5), negatively rather as *ἔργα νεκρά* (vi. 1), *i.e.* as works which have not, as all living creatures have, a living energy, which ought here to consist in the attainment of the divine good-pleasure, rather as all dead things, a defiling energy, in this case defiling the conscience with guilt (ix. 14); comp. Pfleiderer, p. 339 [E. T. ii. 67], who, however, it is true, adds here, "that these works belong to death, and deliver men over to death," by which the idea of death is taken in a double sense, and partly in the sense of spiritual death, which is quite unproved here. Gess also, p. 448, mixes up this with the right one.

relationship, because that presupposes a fellowship of men with God, which cannot exist between sinful men and a holy God; and as the fulfilment of the covenant promise can take place only within covenant relationship, this became impossible to all the members of the Old Covenant by their transgressions.[7]

(*c*) As, now, God, even at the setting up of the covenant, could foresee that transgressions would never cease, to prevent the full accomplishment of the covenant relationship, there was essentially connected with the law of the Old Covenant a provision, by which transgression was atoned for, and the defective fulfilment of the law was, as it were, adjusted, at least so far as the forgiveness of sins was generally possible, and no sin of wilfulness deserving of death (note *b*) had been committed. This institution was the priesthood and the institution of sacrifice, by which the people were to be put into the position of perfection (τελείωσις), *i.e.* into that condition, perfectly corresponding to the holiness of the divine covenant, in which the covenant relation could be in its fullest sense realized.[8] If, now, through the Old Testament

[7] With the question, how it came about that in the Old Covenant transgressions of the law never ceased, our Epistle does not meddle; there is not anywhere, in consequence, a word said to trace it to the σάρξ, as is done by Paul. By its distinction between sins of weakness and sins of wilfulness, a distinction we found in Peter (§ 42, *b*; 44, *c*), and in a certain sense even in the teaching of Jesus (§ 22, *b*), it is not to be supposed that all sins in an equal way are to be regarded as opposition to God in principle, which brings death (and therewith the opposite of the promise), as with Paul, who never refers to any such distinction, but rather regards all sins as alike deadly (§ 80, *c*, footnote 11).

[8] In this rule, which, as with Paul, comes to be subordinate to the rule of life given in the law, the author sees the peculiar weak point of the Old Testament law. Wherever he speaks of the law and its commandments, it is nearly always the law relating to priests (vii. 5, 16, 18, 19, 28), or the laws relating to sacrifice (viii. 4, ix. 22, x. 1, 8), along with the rules for sacred worship connected therewith (ix. 1: δικαιώματα λατρίας), and the regulations about meats, drinks, and washings (ix. 10) that are meant. According to vii. 11, the whole legal constitution depends on the priesthood, and with the latter the whole law is changed (ver. 12); according to viii. 6, the priestly action is the standard for the perfection of the covenant; for by that alone could the object of the covenant relation be realized, along with the bringing in of the τελείωσις of the members of the covenant, by means of that could the Old Covenant become a saving institute. Accordingly, that which is to bring about the salvation promised in the covenant relation is not, as with Paul, the δικαιοσύνη, to be effected by a perfect fulfilling of the law, but the τελείωσις, which, in spite of an ever defective fulfilling of the law, is to be effected by the saving institute given in the law itself.

priesthood perfection could have been really attained, there would naturally have been no need of a New Covenant with a new priesthood (vii. 11). But, as a matter of fact, the law, which established this priesthood, brought nothing to perfection (ver. 19), as is clear from this, that all, even the righteous of the Old Covenant, needed perfecting (xi. 40); it is thus proved to be ineffectual and unprofitable (*τὸ αὐτῆς ἀσθενὲς καὶ ἀνωφελές*: vii. 18). It set up priests who had infirmity themselves, and on that account required atonement (vv. 27, 28; comp. v. 2, 3); it assigned the priesthood to mortal, and therefore to changing men (vii. 8, 23); while by connecting the priesthood with fleshly descent, it proved to be but an *ἐντολὴ σαρκινή* (ver. 16). These priests served, to be sure, in the Holy Place, but only in that made with hands (ix. 11, 24), the shadowy copy of the true (heavenly) holy place (vv. 23, 24: *τὰ ὑποδείγματα, τὰ ἀντίτυπα τῶν ἀληθινῶν*; comp. viii. 5: *οἵτινες ὑποδείγματι καὶ σκιᾷ λατρεύουσιν*), which belongs to the earthly world (ix. 1: *τὸ ἅγιον κοσμικόν*). These sacrifices could not effect what they ought to have effected, the *τελειῶσαι τὸν λατρεύοντα* (ix. 9), as the need of their continual repetition shows (x. 1); the conscience was not purified from the consciousness of guilt by them (vv. 2, 3), because the blood of animals could not take away sin (vv. 4, 11; comp. ix. 12); they could only effect Levitical purification, *i.e.* a *καθαρότης τῆς σαρκός* (ix. 13). They could hence mediate no real approach to God, as the setting up of a Holy Place separate from the Holy of Holies itself shows in emblem (ix. 8, 9), and all the other ordinances also, which had in view Levitical purity, are only fleshly ordinances (ix. 10: *δικαιώματα σαρκός*), and therefore, in reference to the chief end of the law, unprofitable (xiii. 9).[9]

[9] Quite similarly with Paul, according to § 66, *a*, it is a settled point *à priori* to the Christian consciousness that righteousness cannot be attained by obedience to the law, because in that case the grace which is given in Christ would be in vain. But while he seeks the reason of the fact, that the law does not attain its chief aim in the carnal nature of man (§ 72, *a*), here it lies rather in the carnal nature of the law itself. It is thereby no doubt to be considered, that by the law Paul thinks especially of the rule of life required by it, the Epistle to the Hebrews of the saving institution provided by it, and that *σάρξ* in our Epistle is never used in the specifically Pauline sense (§ 68, *b*), but always of the flesh in its strict sense, *i.e.* the earthly material matter of the human body (comp. § 27, *a*).

(*d*) If the atoning work of the Old Covenant has not fulfilled its proper purpose, then must it, as the principal part of the law, have been given for some other purpose.[10] But this purpose can have been nothing else than the shadowy representation of future things (x. 1 : *σκιὰ . . . τῶν μελλόντων ἀγαθῶν, οὐκ . . . εἰκὼν τῶν πραγμάτων*), a prophecy in deeds of the atoning arrangement of the New Covenant. This typical conception of the holy institutions of Israel, already hinted at in the teaching of Jesus and the first apostles, is found also in the earlier Epistles of Paul (§ 73, *c*); and in the Epistles of the Imprisonment the expression is used on their principles, quite reminding us of x. 1 (Col. ii. 17; comp. § 105, *d*). We have not therefore here to do with a Pauline view, adopted in the Epistle to the Hebrews, but with an early apostolic view, which Paul no doubt incidentally accepts, but which is carried to its fullest results only in the Epistle to the Hebrews.[11]

§ 116. *The Promise of the New Covenant.*

The Old Testament itself points to the transitory character of the law, and of the whole covenant resting on it, while it presents to view a new one with better promises (*a*). In conformity with this, it is the same revelation of God, which is given in the word of God of the Old Testament as in that of the New (*b*). With this corresponds the use our author

[10] Although, according to § 72, *c*, Paul, led on by a similar reflection, indicates another purpose for the law (in his sense) than that apparently lying on the surface, yet one must not conclude, with Riehm, p. 135, that our author attributes to the law of sacrifice a purpose analogous to that of Paul, namely, to keep alive through the remembrance of sin the need of salvation, and along with that the longing for a perfect salvation; for, x. 3, the effect of *ἀνάμνησις ἁμαρτιῶν* serves only as an evidence of the insufficiency of the Old Testament atonement, but is not valid as an indication of a higher purpose, and there is elsewhere in our Epistle no connection with such thoughts.

[11] How far this is carried out is made most evident from xiii. 11, 12, when even such a fact as the burning of bodies offered in sacrifice without the camp is considered typical. But Judaism is by no means thereby declared to be one entire unreal shadow, and Christianity to be the real original substance thereof (Pfleiderer, p. 364 [E. T. ii. 93]), but the former is the preparatory saving institute, prophetically pointing to the perfect. The essential difference between this way of regarding the law of worship and that of Philo, Riehm, pp. 256–259, 660–662, has well shown.

makes of the Scriptures, whose learned method bears traces of Alexandrian culture (*c*). On the ground of Old Testament prophecy, the author sees the time for the abrogation of the Old Covenant to be already come, if from pædagogic reasons he announces this for the most part only indirectly (*d*).

(*a*) If the first step towards the fulfilment of the promise, as it was made by the setting up of the covenant at Sinai (§ 115, *a*), has not attained its end, then the law then given can have been but a provisional one (*ἐντολὴ προάγουσα*), whose supersession (*ἀτέθησις*) must come finally (vii. 18). This *ἐντολή* is now in the first the fleshly commandment, which sets up the Levitical priesthood (ver. 16); but with the change of the priesthood, which is replaced by another higher priesthood, the whole law, which constitutes the atoning institute resting on this priesthood, is at the same time changed, and therefore in its ancient form abrogated (ver. 12). But such a new priesthood is already introduced (vii. 21, 28) by a word of God (Ps. cx. 4), spoken in the Old Covenant, of course after the giving of the law, and similarly the word Ps. xl. 6–8 sets aside the imperfect offerings of the law (x. 8, 9).[1] As, now, the atoning institute by which the *τελείωσις* necessary for the complete realization of the covenant relation, and for the attainment of the covenant promise, is to be brought about, is an essential fundamental element of the covenant (§ 115, *c*), then with its abrogation the abrogation of the Old Covenant must at the same time be taken into view. But this very thing is already indicated in the prophecy of a New Covenant (viii. 13); for there had been no room for any such covenant, if the first had been faultless (ver. 7), *i.e.* if it had not left the hope, which it had begotten, unfulfilled at the decisive point. And if there is to be now a new and a better covenant (comp. vii. 22: *κρείττων διαθήκη*), then must it be confirmed as a valid ordinance on better promises (viii. 6). But what those better promises are,

[1] The provisional character of the law depending on this atoning institute is therewith confirmed; all its fleshly ordinances are imposed only till the time when the promised improvement shall come (ix. 10). Paul also testifies to the transitory character of the law (§ 72, *c*), only our Epistle does not more closely coincide with him, as there the law, with its works, gives place to justifying righteousness; here, the law, with its atonement, makes way for the new atonement given in Christ.

the prophecy of Jeremiah (xxxi. 31–34), quoted in vv. 8–12, tells us; the New Covenant promises the law written on the heart (§ 115, *b*, footnote 3), the knowledge of God become general, and the complete forgiveness of sins. As, now, it was to the author the chief defect of the Old Covenant that its saving institute could not bring about a full forgiveness of sins, so the third promise is to him above all else of importance.[2]

(*b*) That there is really in the Old Covenant a prophecy both of the salvation given directly in the New, and of the salvation waiting its full realization in it, lies in the identity of the revelation of God in the Old and New Covenants. In the Old Covenant, God has often and in many ways spoken to the fathers in the prophets, as His organs (i. 1), as now in the Son; and, according to ii. 2–4, the word of the law is just as inviolably stedfast (*βέβαιος*), as that spoken by Jesus and His ear-witnesses was confirmed (*ἐβεβαιώθη*) by signs.[3] The revelation of God in the Son is, to be sure, the last and highest, and it demands most stringently a hearing and a reception, because it offers to men the highest salvation. But as to its nature, the New Testament revelation is, quite as

[2] In fact, the setting up of the new perfect priesthood already promised in the Old Testament (vii. 11–17) is also designated (ver. 19) as the introduction of a better hope, *i.e.* of the real atonement to be hoped for by it, not merely typical; and thus, with the introduction of the new offering promised by it (x. 5–9), there is given the certainty of the complete forgiveness of sins to be looked for in the New Covenant (vv. 17, 18). It is therefore, to be sure, to be noticed that the New Covenant has *better* promises, only in so far as in it a more complete realization is promised, of what was sought for in the Old Covenant by its atoning institute, that thus it has to do only with the same promises which refer to the setting up of the New Covenant relation itself, and which are therefore directly fulfilled by the introduction of that New Covenant. But the covenant promise itself remains quite the *same* in the New Covenant as in the Old (§ 115, *a*), because it is just it which is fulfilled in the former.

[3] One must not say that to the New Testament word of revelation a higher authority is ascribed (Riehm, p. 82); for if the despising of Christ is reckoned more culpable than the despising of Moses, this is made to depend, not on the higher authority of His words, but on the richer gifts which are received from Him, which hence make the despising all the more culpable,—a thought which is implied also in the passage ii. 2–4, where those gifts are expressly designated as the deliverance announced in the words of Jesus and His apostles. Also the way in which Riehm seeks to infer, from xii. 25, that the divine revelations bore in the Old Covenant an earthly, as they bear in the New a heavenly character, as the former announce the will of God specially modified by the earthly relations of a definite period (pp. 94–97), introduces a true but irrelevant

with Paul and Peter (§ 89, *a*; 46, *a*), just such a word of God as God had spoken in the Old Testament (xiii. 7: ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ; vi. 5: Θεοῦ ῥῆμα; v. 12: τὰ λόγια τοῦ Θεοῦ). Conversely, the latter retains its inviolable validity in the New Covenant. Even to us, even to Christians (comp. § 73, *a*), God speaks exclusively by the word of the Old Testament (xii. 5); and the living and effectual word of God, which, for the purpose of warning the readers, is described (iv. 12) as surely executing the judgments threatened in it, and as judging the innermost heart of men, is from the connection a word from the Old Testament Psalms.

(*c*) Because God Himself speaks in the Old Testament, the New Testament citations, which, moreover, are quite preponderatingly taken from the Book of Psalms, are introduced, deviating from Paul's way (§ 74, *a*), mostly as spoken directly by God (i. 5, 13, and often), even when they appear in their original connection to have been spoken not by God, and even when the words are in the third person about God (i. 6, 7, 8; iv. 4, 7, vii. 21, x. 30).[4] In others the author proceeds as Paul does, quite disregarding the connection and the historical reference of the particular passages (§ 74, *c*) in his use of

thought into the passage, which simply puts God speaking from Sinai by earthly messengers in opposition to God speaking from heaven, and announcing the atonement perfected by the New Testament Mediator (ver. 24),—an atonement in which we, along with all the pious of the Old Covenant, share (vv. 22, 23). Also the πολυμερῶς καὶ πολυτρόπως (i. 1) seems rather to express the riches and fulness of the divine revelation, than the defect of all prophecy so spiritedly set forth by Riehm, pp. 90–92, as appearing in fragments, and therefore in different parts and forms.

[4] There occur about seventeen quotations from the Psalms and a few from the Pentateuch, two from Isaiah and Jeremiah, and one each from Habakkuk, Haggai, and the Proverbs. If, iii. 7, ix. 8, x. 15, the Holy Ghost appears as the speaker, it is thereby only meant that God by His Spirit speaks in the sacred writers (comp. § 46, *a*), as elsewhere these passages are brought forward as the words of God (comp. iv. 3, 5, 7, 8, viii. 8, 13). Only in ii. 6 is a passage from the Psalms (viii. 5) brought forward with the indefinite formula, διεμαρτύρατο δέ που τις λέγων, because there God is Himself addressed; and in iv. 7 David is designated as the medium of revelation (i. 1) by the words ἐν Δαυὶδ λέγων, as the author, following the superscription of the LXX., regarded him as the author of Psalm xcv., because there the point of time of an utterance in it was of importance. Where Christ appears as the speaker (ii. 11, 12, 13, x. 5, 8, 9), He is really, according to direct Messianic interpretation, regarded as the speaker in those passages, as in xii. 21, ix. 20, where He has not to do specially with Scripture quotations, but with words of Moses which the Scriptures record.

Scripture, on the supposition that the Scriptures generally, where the text to any extent allows it, prophesy directly of Messiah; and so he indicates passages as directly Messianic in which the Messianic lies in the highest degree indirectly or typically (i. 5, 8, 9, 13, ii. 6 ff., v. 6, x. 5), even where the Old Testament passages undoubtedly treat of Jehovah (i. 6, 10–12), or where only the phraseology of the LXX.[5] suggests such a reference (i. 6, x. 5, 37), and he makes Christ Himself speak in the passages cited, ii. 11–13, x. 5–7. But as Peter, according to § 39, *a*, *b*, had incidentally sought to prove that Old Testament passages could be understood only of the Messiah, so our author seeks expressly, iv. 6–9, to show, that the passage about the rest of God (Ps. xcv. 11) cannot refer to the rest in the land of Canaan, and, xi. 13–16, that the complaint of the patriarchs as to their being foreigners must refer to the heavenly fatherland. We would not therefore in this see, with Riehm, p. 261, the forced method of the use of Scripture akin to that of Philo. But there is involved, perhaps, this amount of truth, that the passages brought forward by him with such painstaking care as to give to their citation a literary dash, are pressed by the author for his argument to the uttermost (ii. 6–9, iii. 7–iv. 10), and that in particular, vii. 1–25, he regards as significant what the Scripture says of Melchisedec, and what *it does not say* (ver. 3).[6]

[5] The author follows, to be sure, and so far he differs from Paul (§ 74, *b*), so exclusively the LXX., that he betrays scarce any knowledge of the original text, and adopts that translation even with its errors and additions (i. 7, ii. 7, x. 38, xii. 5, 6, 15; comp. i. 6, xii. 21); he even grounds his arguments on texts wrongly translated (x. 5–10, xii. 26, 27), where, moreover, he apparently cites the text lying before him, agreeing most nearly with our Codex Alexandrinus, with varying exactness, as Paul does (comp. Bleek, *der Brief an die Hebräer*, Berlin 1828, i. p. 368).

[6] The manner in which, in this section, what the Scriptures say of Melchisedec is regarded not as a historical account, but as a typical prophecy exclusively, which has its special significance for the Christian present, is peculiar (comp. Rom. iv. 23, 24, and therewith § 73, *c*). It is an analogous instance when, ix. 8, in an institution of the law regard is had to what the Holy Ghost (who caused it to be recorded) wished to be thereby signified, whereby, as with Paul (§ 73, *a*), the present readers of the Scriptures and not the former are considered to have been mainly in the eye of the Spirit. On the other hand, there nowhere occurs any instance of proper allegorizing, as there is even in Paul (§ 73, *b*); the typological value of Melchisedec being ready to hand through Ps. cx. The characters of the former times are brought forward in chap. xi. not as types, but only as examples by way of exhortation.

(*d*) The author apparently avoids saying explicitly that the period which prophecy has in view for the transitional duration of the Old Testament institution of atonement is past. But there can be no doubt that in the opinion of the author it is past. The rules of worship of the Old Covenant for him belong to the past (ix. 1 : *εἶχεν*); the time when the Holy Place yet stood is a past time (ix. 8; comp. x. 19); with the entrance of complete forgiveness of sins the sin-offering has ceased (x. 18; comp. ver. 9 : *ἀναιρεῖ τὸ πρῶτον*); and the thankoffering, which is well-pleasing to God, is no longer that of the Old Testament (xiii. 15, 16).[7] The exhortation of the Epistle culminates in the demand to abandon fellowship in the worship of the Old Testament (xiii. 13; comp. § 111, *a*), and he suitably presupposes that the Levitical worship has lost every claim upon his readers, since also the author aims at this throughout the rest of the Epistle, indirectly rather, by leading his readers over to the conviction of the complete sufficiency of the Christian institution. But the author scarcely considers the abrogation of the law to be confined to the offering of sacrifice, as Ritschl, p. 163, supposes; as even the ordinances mentioned ix. 10 were imposed but to the time of reformation, which doubtless has already begun, and makes the continuance of them useless (xiii. 9).[8]

[7] It is therefore quite a mistake, when Baur, p. 248, following Schwegler, asserts that the Levitical worship is to continue till the Parousia as an integral element, not indeed of perfect Christianity, but of that which presently exists. The passage viii. 13 can prove nothing of the sort, as the word of God, which has declared the first covenant to be so old that it is ready to vanish, *i.e.* to be abrogated, was spoken even by an Old Testament prophet; it cannot therefore be denied that it is now yet nearer the vanishing.

[8] To be sure, the range of the statement, that with the change of the priesthood there is a change of the whole law (vii. 12), cannot be measured with perfect accuracy, inasmuch as the word *νόμος* usually in our Epistle designates the law, in so far as it set up an atoning institute (§ 115, *c*, footnote 8). But not without a purpose is that stated so generally. The considerations on which Paul ever asks the Jewish Christians to abide by the law (§ 87, *b*) have fallen away from the historical horizon of our author (§ 111, *a*), and in proportion as any dependence on the ancient law has become dangerous for the readers, must the complete dissolution of that be indicated, to which nothing in principle stands in the way.

§ 117. *The Realization of the New Covenant.*

The salvation given in the New Covenant appears throughout as intended for the people of the Old Covenant (*a*). But only believing Israel has a share in the New Covenant, as those Israelites who abide in unbelief fall under the righteous punishment of their apostasy (*b*). This sifting had to occur, as along with the perfect sacrifice and the setting up of the New Covenant, the Messianic perfect time had come (*c*). The perfected salvation promised is yet future, to be sure; but as it is guaranteed by the introduction of the New Covenant, to the Christian consciousness it seems to be already present (*d*).

(*a*) The people of Israel, with whom God made the Old Covenant at Sinai, are designated at times the people simply (vii. 5, 11, 27: λαός), at other times the people of God (xi. 25), and they are at the same time the receivers of the blessings of the New Covenant. The perfect high priest atones for and sanctifies the people (ii. 17, xiii. 12; comp. ii. 11); to the people of God the promise of the Sabbath rest remains in reserve (iv. 9); and that we are not thereby in any way to think of a newly elected people of God, is clear from ii. 16, according to which Christ takes hold of the σπέρμα Ἀβραάμ. This view is not explained by the consideration that the author is writing to Jewish-Christian readers, because, as a matter of fact, the Christian Church in his day was already composed of more heathen than Jews, but only by this consideration, that he regards the people of the Old Covenant as in principle the proper subjects of the Church of the New Testament. We stand here quite on the ground of the early apostolic view (§ 42, 44), according to which the people of Israel are regarded as, in the first place, the proper receivers of the Messianic salvation. This view follows of itself from the conception of the Messianic salvation as belonging to the New Covenant (§ 115, *a*), promised in the first place, indeed, to the people of the Old Covenant, and partly realized in the promise given to them, and partly yet to be realized. According to ix. 15, the called are evidently the members of the Old Covenant; for in order that they may receive the promise of the eternal κληρονομία, there is provided in the New Covenant a deliverance from the trans-

gressions committed during the old. Just so the *κληρονόμοι τῆς ἐπαγγελίας*, to whom God has even in Abraham's time ratified by an oath (vi. 17) His unchangeable purpose, are all the descendants of Abraham, whether they live under the Old or under the New Covenants. If Christ has Himself prepared the house of the Old Testament theocracy (iii. 3), then must it from the beginning have been established with reference to the final salvation to be brought in by Him; and if the sufferings of the Old Testament people of God are to be regarded as the reproach of Christ (xi. 26), then not only is it implied that the latter is injured in the former, but from the connection this also, that in the founder of the theocracy rests the security also of its completion—a completion which must change all the sufferings of the people of God into glory.

(*b*) It is clear from vi. 12, that the attainment of the promise by the members of the covenant even now, as § 115, *b*, depends on a condition, that therefore not the people of Israel as such, but in so far as they fulfil their covenant duties, attain to the salvation preserved and guaranteed in the New Covenant, just as with Peter (§ 44, *a*). The Old Testament people of God form even already the household of God (*οἶκος Θεοῦ*; comp. § 109, *b*, footnote 3), in which Moses acted as a *θεράπων* (iii. 2–5). Even yet that very Israel constituted that house of God, to which the author and his readers belonged (ver. 6: *οὗ οἶκός ἐσμεν ἡμεῖς*), but only on the supposition that they hold fast the hope of the people of God (*ἐὰν . . . κατάσχωμεν*); and that, as we shall see, is the specific Old Testament duty, which only believing Israel had discharged. And so it is not Israel as a nation, but believing Israel, which forms the Messianic Church. All the members of the Old Covenant people are, to be sure, called to the attainment of the promise (ix. 15), but those only, who confess Jesus as the Apostle of God and the High Priest (comp. iv. 14), are really partakers of the heavenly calling (iii. 1).[1] It follows of itself, that all Israel remaining in unbelief are

[1] The *κλῆσις ἐπουράνιος* reminds one of the *ἡ ἄνω κλῆσις*, Phil. iii. 14. In other respects, the want of the idea of election shows that we have not here to do with the technical Pauline idea of calling (comp. § 88, *d*), but with the Old Testament Petrine (§ 45, *b*, footnote 2).

shut out from the fellowship of this family of God, as Peter already teaches (§ 42, *b*; 44, *c*). The unbelieving are hence spoken of, iii. 12, as falling away from the living God, and, xii. 15, 16, the falling away from Christ is characterized by an Old Testament expression (comp. Deut. xxix. 18, and the ordinary designation of idolatry as fornication) as a relapse into idolatry, for which, as for all sins of wilfulness, expulsion from the nation was inflicted (comp. § 115, *b*; Num. xv. 30). Unbelieving Israel had no more a share in the sin-offering of the New Covenant, and therefore no share in the covenant itself, and in the promise, whose fulfilment it realizes (xiii. 10–12), and therefore it was fitting that there should be a complete separation of the believers in Israel from them (ver. 13). But it is clear as day, that the author, who strives to deliver the Jewish Christians from the bonds of fellowship with their countrymen, both in national matters and in worship, could not have refused to the Gentiles participation in the salvation provided in Christ, or that he could not have bound them to receive the law, *i.e.* to pass over into Judaism.[2]

(*c*) The reason why not Israel as a whole, but only the believing portion, has a share in the salvation of the New Covenant, lies in this, that the Messianic fulness of times has come, as the early apostolic preaching has already announced (§ 40, *a*), and that all the prophets had prophesied of a sifting for that time, in consequence of which only a portion of the people would be actually partakers in the Messianic

[2] The passage ii. 9 (comp. ver. 15), to be sure, according to the circle of thought in our Epistle, only states, in the first place, that Christ has tasted death for each one, who belongs to the seed of Abraham (ver. 16), and from v. 9 one might with the greatest probability *draw the conclusion*, that if Christ has become an author of eternal salvation for *all* who fulfil the condition there presented, there is thereby implied indirectly the exclusion of every national or legal condition, although, looking at the context, any such consequence is not in view. But that the author has acknowledged the complete justification of Gentile Christians cannot be doubted, unless one ventures to question the statements so carefully put and quoted in note *a*, as Gess, p. 478. How, in the opinion of the author, participation by Gentiles in the salvation of the Old Testament people was brought about, on that point our Epistle gives no hint. At a time when the preponderating majority of Christians already consisted of those who had once been heathens, he can scarcely longer consider them as being sprung from the original stock of the Church, as Peter does, § 44, *d*; he must rather have regarded them, as James does, § 43, *c*, as a New Covenant people called alongside the old people of God.

salvation (comp. § 42, *c*; 91, *b*). God has spoken to us in His Son at the end (ἐπ' ἐσχάτου) of these days (i. 1), *i.e.* the days of the pre-Messianic age (ὁ αἰὼν οὗτος), and at the end of the period belonging thereto (ἐπὶ συντελείᾳ τῶν αἰώνων) is the perfect sacrifice offered which really takes away sin (ix. 26). But with the obtaining of a completely valid forgiveness of sin, according to § 116, *a*, is fulfilled the promise, which refers to the setting up of a New Covenant, and with the promise the times of reformation have come (ix. 10: καιρὸς διορθώσεως), which in place of the typical atoning institution puts the real, and in place of the imperfect of the Old Covenant puts the perfect of the New. The sacrificial death of Christ forms, therefore, the dividing point of the two ages; with Him the Messianic age (ὁ αἰὼν μέλλων) has for the Christians come.[3] They have already tasted its powers (vi. 5); they have already received its blessings (ix. 11, x. 1: τὰ μέλλοντα ἀγαθά), *i.e.* those promised at the entrance of the New Covenant, and which are connected with the οἰκουμένη μέλλουσα, which is subject to Christ (ii. 5).[4]

(*d*) Although with the fulfilment of the promise, explained § 116, *a*, the Messianic time has come, the members of the New Covenant even yet wait the fulfilment of the proper covenant promise, and in so far Messianic perfection is for them even yet future.[5] This final consummation is evident

[3] The Messianic age has already come, according to Peter also (§ 40, *a*; 48, *a*). But there is, according to Riehm, p. 248, a more specific reference in our Epistle to the doctrine of the two ages of later Judaism (comp. § 67, *a*), which is foreign to Philo, the end of the pre-Messianic (i. 1) being distinguished from the beginning of the Messianic. But if the Christian *present* is already the αἰὼν μέλλων, then the time of the Old Covenant may be quite properly designated the καιροὶ ἐνεστηκότες (ix. 9), although the latter time, in which the tabernacle still stood, is to the Christian consciousness a *past* time, according to § 116, *d*. With the Philonic doctrine of the archetypal heavenly world, which Pfleiderer, p. 329 [E. T. ii. 56], introduces, this view has nothing whatever to do.

[4] The righteous of the Old Covenant also can only share in the salvation of this time in so far as they are perfected by the sacrifice of the New Covenant (xi. 39, 40; comp. xii. 23), as, according to ix. 26, that sacrifice has a retrospective efficacy, and thus they become members of the New Covenant. There is thus here the same thought involved as in Peter, where the salvation provided in Christ has to be offered to all the dead ere the decision as to condemnation and deliverance at the last judgment can be given (§ 50, *d*).

[5] Quite as we found in Peter, from the beginning of the Messianic consummation (§ 44, 45), which has already been fulfilled by the appearance of Messiah (§ 48, 49), is quite distinct the goal of that consummation, which yet remains as

in the passage xiii. 14 (*τὴν μέλλουσαν πόλιν ἐπιζητοῦμεν*, comp. xi. 10, 16), according to an idea familiar in the native Judaeo-Palestinian theology (comp. Riehm, p. 248), and therefore not Philonic (comp. Pfleiderer, p. 328 [E. T. ii. 55]); an idea which Paul has already stripped of its apocalyptic meaning, and has stamped as the expression for the ideal Israel (Gal. iv. 26; comp. § 90, *c*), but which originally includes the presupposition, that Israel as a people is regarded as the Church of the last time (§ 42, *c*), as the heavenly Jerusalem. But it is peculiar to our author, that, according to xii. 22, Christians are already come to Mount Zion, and to the city of the living God lying about it, the heavenly Jerusalem, while unbelieving Israel similarly are still gathered about Mount Sinai (vv. 18–21). In this way of looking at it there is expressed that interpenetrating of the present and the future, the ideal and the actual, which is involved even in the teaching of Jesus about the kingdom of God (§ 15, *c*), which is expressed by Peter in his hope anticipating the future (§ 51, *c*), and is simply hinted at by Paul in his earlier Epistles (§ 96, *b*), and appears in fuller completeness in the Epistles of the Imprisonment (§ 104, *d*). Because that final consummation is completely secured by the introduction of the New Covenant, it appears ideally as already present. Yes, one is reminded at once of the origin of that idea in the teaching of Jesus about the kingdom of God, if Christians are, according to xii. 28, already in idea to receive the *βασιλεία ἀσάλευτος*, although that kingdom can only really come into existence when the shaking of the heaven and the earth prophesied by Haggai (ii. 7) has come; while the kingdom of the Old Covenant people, inaugurated by a simple shaking of the earth (Ex. xix. 18), is characterized in the same prophecy as passing away (vv. 26, 27).

the object of Christian hope (§ 50). Just so, on the one hand, is the scriptural promise with Paul realized in the fulness of the time (§ 73, 75), and on the other the promise given to Israel remains to be still the object of Christian hope (§ 97, *d*).

CHAPTER II.

THE HIGH PRIEST OF THE NEW COVENANT.

Comp. Moll, *Christologia in ep. ad Hebr. scripta proposita*, Halle, 1854, 1855, 1859.

§ 118. *The Messiah as Son.*

Jesus has been exalted to the godlike Messianic dominion of the world, because He was the Son of God (*a*). But the name Son of God designates in itself for our author a superhuman, eternal, Divine Being (*b*). But this Being can be but as the effulgence of the divine glory, in which the Divine Being has perfectly stamped Himself (*c*). But the Son has become the Messianic ruler of the world only, because He is the self-efficacious creator of the world, and sustains the world by the word of His almighty power, as He has also prepared the house of the Old Testament theocracy (*d*).

(*a*) The author of our Epistle was not one of the eye-witnesses of the life of Jesus, neither was he thought worthy of a special appearance of the exalted Christ, as Paul was; but what he knows of Him he has received from eye-witnesses as opportunity was given (ii. 3). But these eye-witnesses proclaimed to him, according to § 39, 50, Jesus as brought again from the dead (xiii. 20), the divine Lord exalted to heaven (iv. 14, vi. 20), who now, in conformity with Ps. cx. 1 (i. 13), sits at the right hand of God (i. 3, viii. 1, xii. 2), *i.e.* shares His honour and dominion of the world (§ 19, *c*). He therefore applies an Old Testament passage directly to Christ (i. 10–12; comp. Ps. cii. 26–28), which refers to the κύριος-Jehovah, and praises Him as the unchangeable (comp. xiii. 8), just as Peter (§ 39, *c*; 50, *a*) and Paul (§ 76, *b*) do. Yes, even when he looks at the earthly life of Jesus, He appears to him in the light of this His exaltation as our Lord (vii. 14, xiii. 20), or as the Lord simply (ii. 3).[1] But in His exalta-

[1] It points back to the earliest proclamation of Jesus, when Christ is designated by His earthly historical name as Ἰησοῦς, even ten times, *i.e.* quite as often as in the whole collected Epistles of Paul together. Along with this, Χριστός (iii. 6,

tation He is, without more ado, addressed as ὁ Θεός (i. 8, 9); and this, in any case, goes beyond Rom. ix. 5, as He is also praised (xiii. 21) by a doxology. Through this His exaltation to divine dignity, such as Messiah alone can attain to, it is established that He is none other than the Son of God, *i.e.* the agent chosen of God, according to prophecy, for the completing of all the divine purposes of redemption. The substance of the confession, therefore, which all Jews who believe on the Messiah are to hold fast, is: *Ἰησοῦς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ* (iv. 14). As Son He was the last and the greatest of God's messengers (comp. § 13, *c*), in whom God has spoken to His people at the end of the pre-Messianic age (i. 1), and who on that account is confessed by the Christian Church as the Sent of God (iii. 1: ὁ ἀπόστολος . . . τῆς ὁμολογίας ἡμῶν). As Son, He is set over the house of the theocracy as Lord (iii. 6), in which Moses was but a servant (ver. 5); even the οἰκουμένη μέλλουσα is put under Him (ii. 5), and He is made by God heir of all (i. 2), while the Father has entrusted to Him divine power and lordship in the everlasting Messianic kingdom (ver. 8).[2]

(*b*) If Jesus, as the Son, has been exalted to the godlike dominion of the world, it would readily enough occur to the author, learned as he was in the Scriptures, who searched the Old Testament not for its original meaning, but who sought in it the pre-intimations of his own Christian thoughts (comp. § 116, *c*), to reflect in this way, that the name of Son, which Jesus had already received in the Old Testament as a name peculiar to Himself (i. 4),[3] in that there the Messiah is desig-

ix. 11), or more frequently ὁ Χριστός (iii. 14, v. 5, vi. 1, ix. 14, 24, 28, xi. 26), appears quite as a *nomen proprium*, as it does already in Peter (§ 48, *a*) and in Paul (§ 76, *a*), and x. 10, xiii. 8, 21, Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, which we find, besides, in Paul and Peter and James (§ 52, *c*, footnote 4), but never the specifically Pauline Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς. In Old Testament citations and in words of the author's own κύριος appears, seldomer ὁ κύριος (viii. 2, 11, xii. 14), often as a divine name. But only in xiii. 20 is ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν connected with the name of Jesus.

[2] If, therefore, the punishment of death has been appointed even for despising the law of Moses, there is a yet more terrible punishment appointed for despising the Son of God (x. 28, 29; comp. vi. 6). With Paul also, Christ is put into the full dignity of sonship just by His exaltation; yet he designates as the inheritance which the Son receives from the Father, not so much the Messianic lordship, as rather the divine glory, to a share of which he has been admitted (§ 77, *b*, *d*).

[3] One may doubt whether the author has reflected on this, that Israel collectively, in the Old Testament, is designated as Son. But this can to no extent

nated simply as the Son (Ps. ii. 7; 2 Sam. vii. 14; comp. i. 5, v. 5), must designate the specific nature of Jesus, in virtue of which He has attained to this peerless pre-eminence. The word *υἱός*, without the article, has therefore already become for Him quite a *nomen proprium* (i. 1, iii. 6, v. 8, vii. 28), or, to speak more accurately, it has come to be the specific designation of the nature of a peerless person. If, now (vii. 28), the Son appointed to be a priest is put in opposition to men appointed to be priests, and by *καίπερ ὢν υἱός* (v. 8) the human learning of obedience is indicated as something essentially foreign to His nature, it is made very clear, that to the author this name, as such, designated a superhuman Being, a thing Beyschlag seeks in vain to deny (p. 179). He appears thereby, in the first place, as a fellow of the angels (i. 9 : *οἱ μέτοχοι αὐτοῦ*), who also are superhuman beings; but the peerless name of Son simply, which is given Him as the First-born,[4] designates His nature as simply elevated above that of the angels (vv. 4, 5). If, that is to say, according to vii. 3, Melchisedec is made like to the Son of God in this, that he—namely, in the typical prophetic representation of the Old Testament (§ 116, *c*)—had neither beginning of days nor end of life, then the name of Son designates a nature without beginning—eternal, and therefore

weaken the peerless significance of this name given to Jesus, as that name is never there applied to a single person. The passages in which the theocratic king is so designated, refer, according to his interpretation, directly to Messiah; the passage Prov. iii. 11 was spoken to Christians (xii. 5), who only in a derivative sense are sons of God (ii. 10).

[4] The angels, to be sure, are also designated in the Scriptures as sons of God (comp. § 17, *b*). But if this happens Deut. xxxii. 43 (at least according to the *Codex Alexandrinus* of the LXX., with which the Septuagint text used by our author elsewhere agrees), our author, when he introduces the passage, puts intentionally in place of it (i. 6) *ἄγγελοι θεοῦ*, and he, moreover, designates the Son, who is to be worshipped by them as the *πρωτότοκος*, and that accordingly does not refer to His relation to the whole creation (Riehm, p. 292), or to the human sons of God (Beyschlag, p. 180), but to His relation to those other sons of God. According to Jewish ideas, the whole personal possession of the father passes over to the first-born alone. The First-born of the sons of God has therefore received from the Father a nature which, in a peerless way, is exalted above theirs, and is like that of the Father. Perhaps that is even expressed in the *κεκληρονόμηκεν* (i. 4), if thereby the name of Son, which designates His nature, is here designated as His inheritance. Against the absurdity of referring the name of Son even here throughout to His supernatural generation (von Hofm.), Gess (p. 441 f.) has instituted a superfluous polemic.

divine.[4] For the author it is no longer, as elsewhere in the Old and New Testaments, the designation of a peculiar relation of love to God, but the application of the idea of Son to the ethical similarity of nature to God (§ 21, *c*, footnote 1; § 83, *d*), which also occurs elsewhere in the New Testament, gets here a metaphysical turn, and he makes the name of Son to be the designation of the nature of an eternal, divine person, who, on account of this His peerless nature, exalted far above the angels, is appointed to be the Messiah, *i.e.* to be God's servant, to bring in the Messianic perfection, and to be Lord of the perfected theocracy in the Messianic era.[5]

(*c*) To be sure, if this interpretation of the name Son *per se* was not suggested to him by the Old Testament, the author has rather imported what was given in the historical appearance of Messiah into the prophecy about Him, as it happens throughout on the supposition of a directly Messianic prophecy. Inasmuch as by the exaltation of Jesus to a share in a position of divine dignity, it was proved to him, that the person of the Redeemer was through His peerless nature capable of such dignity, he sought in the Old Testament name of Son for the Messiah an indication of such a nature.[6] This reasoning back-

[5] From this it follows that God cannot be designated (iii. 2) as the creator of Jesus (comp. however, Messner, p. 298), but only as He who made Jesus to be the ἀπόστολος καὶ ἀρχιερεὺς τῆς ὁμολογίας ἡμῶν (ver. 1; comp. Gess, p. 444), and that, in the repeated quotation of Ps. ii. 7 (i. 5, v. 5), no one fixed point in His earthly history can be had in view, when God begot Him to be the Son. From the connection with i. 6, it could not have been at His baptism (Beyschlag, p. 181), nor at His incarnation, but only at the time when God by prophecy first introduced Him into the world as the Son raised above the angels (ver. 4). These words would in each interpretation stand in sharpest contradiction with vii. 3, and for this point of the prophetic word there is kept in view as little any definite reference, as for the future in the passage from Samuel, on which Beyschlag, p. 180, relies. This, therefore, is also specially clear, that the idea of a generation of the Son of God is one strange to our author throughout. To be sure, the ἐξ ἑνὸς πάντες (ii. 11) has usually been understood as that both Christ and Christians had their origin from God (comp. moreover, Riehm, p. 366; Beyschlag, p. 187). But since, in what follows, the relation of oneness on the part of Christ with His brethren (vv. 12, 13) is expressly referred to consanguinity (ver. 14), and this with the seed of Abraham (ver. 16), for whom He interests Himself as their brother (ver. 17), then ver. 11, if it is not to be torn quite away from the context, can refer only to common descent from Abraham (comp. Gess, p. 428). To this it has to be added, that elsewhere also the idea of a generation of sons of God, who are on that account led to glory (ver. 10), is an idea entirely foreign to our Epistle.

[6] The current supposition, that the idea of an eternal divine nature of the Son

wards from the Messianic exaltation of Jesus to the original nature of Him, whom God made to be Messiah, lies very evidently at the basis of the weighty christological statements of our author (i. 3). That is to say, the subject of this relative sentence is not a pre-existent divine intermediate Being, like the Logos, but the Son, in whom God has spoken at the end of the pre-Messianic age (ver. 1), *i.e.* He who in His historical manifestation was chosen to be the Messiah, who, after He had finished His work (ὃς . . . *καθαρισμὸν ποιησάμενος*), has sat down at the right hand of the Majesty. The reason for these statements about the final exaltation of the Son is now to be given by means of an inserted participial clause, forasmuch as it is clear from it, how the original nature of Him must have existed, who could be exalted to a position of such divine honour. That is to say, He must be regarded, on the one hand, as a perfectly Divine Being; and yet, on the other hand, He must be so regarded, that no prejudice be given thereby to Monotheism. But this can be the case only if the Son, as respects His original nature, can be so regarded, that the splendour streaming out from the divine glory is concentrated in a second Being, as it were, of equal glory, in whom that glory is seen, as in its effulgence (*ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης*),[7] and that the whole divine nature is perfectly

is drawn from the Logos doctrine of Philo, and therefore that the idea of an intermediate Being conceived of *à priori* is transferred to Jesus, is therefore in the highest degree unlikely, because the Logos is called no doubt by Philo *πρωτόγονος υἱός*; but He appears to be different as to His nature neither from the world as the *νεώτερος υἱός*, nor from the angels, with whom He, as *ὁ πρεσβύτατος* (*ἀρχάγγελος*), is co-ordinated (Riehm, p. 416 f.). But it is completely excluded for this reason, that, throughout, the historical fact of the exaltation of Jesus to a position of divine honour is the starting-point, and this therefore Pfleiderer, p. 335 [E. T. ii. 63], must declare to be irreconcilable with the former supposition (strictly—a contradiction). Comp. on the other hand, Gess, p. 487 f.; Schenkel, p. 323.

[7] The figurativeness of this expression, evident from the change of figure in the parallel expression, forbids the supposition entirely that God is to be considered as light in the proper sense, or that δόξα is to be taken in the Pauline sense of a luminous light-substance, in which God reveals Himself (§ 76, *d*). Rather δόξα designates everywhere else in the Epistle, where it does not mean simply honour (ii. 7, 9, iii. 3, xiii. 21), only the divine majesty and glory (ix. 5); and if it is presented to the view of the sons of God at the final consummation (ii. 10), it is so only in the general sense, as by Peter (§ 50, *c*, footnote 5), but not at all in the specific sense, as by Paul (§ 97, *c*). Hence the expression in i. 3 has nothing whatever to do with the Pauline *εἰκὼν τοῦ Θεοῦ*, though Riehm, p. 386, compares it with that, as the latter refers to the divine glory of

imprinted on it (*χαρακτὴρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ*). If in this attempt to characterize the nature of the Son of God, which goes beyond Paul, one may see the beginning of a line of speculation allied to the Alexandrian, it is yet by no means clear that the expressions here used are borrowed from it.[8]

(*d*) As in i. 3 the exaltation of the Son is accounted for by a reference to His original nature, even so, ver. 2, His elevation to be heir of all (*ὃν ἔθηκεν κληρονόμον πάντων*) is accounted for in this way, that it is He by whom God made the *αἰῶνες*, *i.e.* the whole of them, which make up the periods of the world. As the elevation of Jesus to divine rule over the universe has become in apostolic preaching in any case a matter of first importance, the propriety for effecting the creation of the world by Him, expressed by the *καί*, can have been but to furnish a reason for the latter fact, a reason from which the former idea was formed. He, who was made Lord over all, must have had *à priori* a relation to that all.[9] It is true that here too it is God ultimately by whom all things were created (ii. 10), and who has perfected the work of creation by the Son (i. 2); but if, according to Ps. cii. 26, Christ has Himself founded the earth, and the heavens are the work of His hands (i. 10), then

the exalted Christ (comp. 76, *d*; 103, *d*); and naturally it is quite impossible linguistically to find, with Gess, p. 437, in *ὤν* the independence of the exalted One, whose divine nature gives in the divine *δόξα* its manifestation. Paul, too, draws conclusions from the exaltation of Christ as to His original nature, although he proceeds not so much from the position of the dignity of the exalted One (comp. also footnote 2), as rather from the inheritance of the divine *δόξα* which He has received (§ 79, *b*); but he has nowhere reflected on the origin of this nature. The way in which our author does this proves that the idea of a generation by God was far enough from his mind (comp. footnote 5).

[8] Moreover, the most closely related are the expressions about the divine *σοφία*, which occur in the Book of Wisdom (vii. 25, 26). The comparison by Philo of the Logos with images of the sun, which, arising from reflections of the sun (comp. Riehm, p. 413), lacks on that account any resemblance, because the idea of a reflection does not lie in the word *ἀπαύγασμα*. But if the human soul, with Philo, has been stamped with the seal of God, whose *χαρακτήρ* the eternal Logos is, and if, in virtue of this relationship, it is called an *ἀπαύγασμα τῆς μακαρίας φύσεως* (comp. Riehm, pp. 413, 414), it is clear from this that the analogous idea, which is thereby won for the Logos, does not express His peerless nature. Riehm, p. 409, has, moreover, produced analogies from the Palestinian theology.

[9] That in this combination Philo's doctrine of the Logos has not been regulative, xi. 3 proves, by which it yet remains, conformably with Gen. i. 3, Ps. xxxiii. 6, that the world was put into its finished condition by the creative word of God, and therefore the Son is by no means identified as the agent of the creative word in this passage. Quite as little is that idea drawn from the Old

the intervention of the Son is unquestionably considered as so much His own act, that He appears thereby as directly equal to God, just as with Paul. This appears to be the case, if not only the world has its subsistence in the Son, as § 103, *b*, but if the divine almighty word is ascribed to the Son just as to God Himself (xi. 3),—that almighty word by which He, as the image of God, essentially equal to Him, continuously upholds the universe, and by His own power maintains its stability (i. 3); from which, finally, it is clear, that any identification of the Son with the Logos cannot even be thought of. Finally, just as from His Lordship over the world in the end, the inference is drawn back to its creation and subsistence through the Son, so the Son, who is set as the Messianic Lord over the house of the perfected theocracy (iii. 6), appears at the same time as He who, at the beginning, prepared the house of the theocracy (ver. 3; comp. § 117, *a*); but thereby it is explicitly replied, ver. 4, that this as little excludes the absolute supremacy of God in the last instance, as the independent action of the Son in the creation of the world excludes the tracing of it back to God.[10]

Testament, as the κύριος, in Ps. cii. 26–28, would not be applied to Christ (i. 10) had it not been a fixed conviction with the author that the creation of the world was by Him, as he elsewhere often enough understands the κύριος of the Old Testament to be Jehovah; yet only this passage treating of Him refers to Christ, and from the context not merely on account of this, but on account of the expressions contained in vv. 11, 12. Finally, one cannot borrow the idea of our author from the Pauline, as it is shown, § 97, *c*, 103, *b*, to be otherwise essentially reached, and the mediatorial position of the Son in the work of creation is held more simply. Gess himself, p. 485, here has recourse to a deduction back from the government of the world on the part of Him who is after, although, remarkably enough, he derives the latter idea from Matt. xxviii. 18.

[10] On these expressions, which may appear stronger regarding the action of Christ as an action effective by His own power than with Paul, Beyschlag's attempt is irredeemably wrecked, to understand the pre-existence of Christ as that of an impersonal principle (pp. 190–200); an attempt which, springing, moreover, simply from dogmatic considerations, was supported by an identification of the image of God with the archetypal image of humanity, an idea lying far apart from our Epistle, and which sought an unjustifiable analogy in a transformation of the angelology altogether foreign to the Jewish spirit (comp. § 79, *c*, footnote 7). It is hence clear that, ii. 12 f., x. 5 f., it is not the pre-existent One who is regarded as speaking in the prophets, as Gess, pp. 428, 449, supposes (comp. on the other hand, § 119, footnotes 1, 3). The activity of Christ in the Old Testament (as Paul sets it forth, § 79, *c*) forms a parallel to the expression in iii. 3, but not such a parallel as would allow us to infer a direct appropriation of Pauline ideas.

§ 119. *The Messianic High Priest.*

Since the Messiah, that He may fulfil the promise of the New Covenant, must be a high priest, the Son must for a little time be made lower than the angels, and take the flesh and blood of His brethren, and share their temptations (*a*). He must, at the same time, prove Himself sinless, and perfect His obedience and faith in the greatest trial (*b*). In room of the priesthood after the order of Aaron, an order which made mortal men priests, Christ is called of God a high priest after the order of Melchisedec, *i.e.* not in virtue of human descent, but in virtue of an endless life, which was in Him on account of His eternal Spirit (*c*). Thus only could He receive an intransmissible priesthood, as God had assured Him by an inviolable oath, and as fitted Him for the discharge of an abiding priestly intercession (*d*).

(*a*) The aspect of the appearance of the Son of God upon the earth, which, from the point of view of His original existence, is designated as an *εἰσέρχεσθαι εἰς τὸν κόσμον* (x. 5),[1] is essentially conditioned by the way our author conceives of the Messianic call of Christ. If Christianity is essentially a New Covenant (§ 115, *a*), it requires also a new Mediator (xii. 24: *διαθήκης νέας μεσίτης*; comp. ix. 15, viii. 6). Such will He be pre-eminently by whom God speaks to His people at the expiry of the pre-Messianic age (i. 1), to announce to them the deliverance prepared in the New Covenant (ii. 3). Since all depends essentially in the New Covenant on the provision made for a perfect atoning institute (§ 116, *a*), to

[1] To refer these words to the historical appearance of Christ, the entrance on His public career (Beyschlag, p. 192 f.; Schenkel, p. 324), would presuppose that even in our Epistle Christ is regarded as coming as such for the sins of the world, while yet only His destination for Israel is kept steadily prominent (§ 117, *a*); it does not correspond to the contents of what follows, as the offering of Himself may indeed be regarded as the purpose of His appearing on the earth, but not as the object of His public appearance, and it takes away from the subject named, neither in this nor in the former verse, its more exact definition, which can lie only on the coming into the world (from a higher state of existence), which has reference to Christ *alone*. The expressions of the passage from the Psalm might equally well apply to the former of these two interpretations; but the reasons brought forward decide for this, that the author in his Messianic application of the Psalm regards the Messiah as Himself speaking, as the prophet had heard Him speak in the spirit at His approaching incarnation.

which belongs a high priest, who, in the room of a people separated from God by sin, can draw near to God and present the sin-offering (viii. 3); the Mediator must also be the High Priest of the New Covenant. The specific contents, therefore, of our confession is not only that Jesus is simply God's messenger (§ 118, *a*), but that He is at the same time High Priest (iii. 1; comp. iv. 14).[2] But now, according to v. 1, 2, it is essential and necessary that the high priest be taken from among men, and be a partaker of human infirmity, that he may discharge his office (*τὰ πρὸς τὸν Θεόν*) with an impassionate, and, towards sinners, a mercifully disposed temper (*μετριοπαθῶν*) for their good. But this can be done by the Son of God, whose name characterizes Him as a superhuman, Divine Being, exalted above the angels; only if for a short time He be made lower than the angels (ii. 9), and becomes a weak and mere Son of man, as Ps. viii. 5, 6 prophesies (ii. 6, 7). The earthly human life of the Son of God appears therefore as a humiliation laid upon Him by God with a view to His Messianic calling.[3] In consequence of this, the *ἁγιάζων* and the *ἁγιαζόμενοι* have one common origin (ii. 11; comp. § 118, *b*, footnote 5), as He who sprang from the tribe of Judah (vii. 14), even as the members of the people whose priest He became (ii. 17), belong to the seed of Abraham (ver. 16). In virtue of this common descent, He

[2] This idea, most intimately connected with the fundamental view of our Epistle, is altogether peculiar to it. Paul has it not, and that the priesthood of the Logos in Philo, on account of its simply metaphysical speculative significance, is something quite different, Riehm (pp. 662–669) has convincingly established. Only as High Priest can Jesus be the security for the better covenant, which guarantees the fulfilment of the promise given in the covenant relation (vii. 22).

[3] Beyschlag, p. 185, wishes to avoid the representation of the incarnation as a humiliation, while he refers the humiliation under the angels to the sufferings, which, however, are expressly distinguished, ver. 9, from His humiliation, and he overlooks the fact that the calling to Jesus as the subject has some argumentative force only in virtue of his distinction between the impersonal pre-existent principle and the person of Jesus; while with us, according to § 118, it is self-evident that the eternal Son of God and the historical Jesus are one identical person. If, moreover, this humiliation is not expressly represented as a voluntary humbling of Himself, as it is with Paul (§ 79, *c*; 103, *c*), it is yet settled, ii. 11, explicitly from Old Testament passages, in which the author regards the prophet as speaking in the name of Messiah (vv. 12, 13), that He is not ashamed to call the children of Abraham His brethren, and that in any case proves that He has willingly put Himself in the situation brought about.

had, according to ver. 14, in quite an adequate way (*παραπλησίως*), a share in the flesh and blood common to all the children of Abraham, *i.e.* in the material substance of their mortal bodies (comp. x. 20).[4] But in order that He may be a sympathizing High Priest, He must in all things (*κατὰ πάντα*) be made like to His brethren (ii. 17); and this could only be, if He was tried in all points *καθ' ὁμοιότητα*, because thus only could He have sympathy with their weaknesses (iv. 15). This happened by His sufferings (ii. 18), for which His flesh was so susceptible, that in the days of His flesh He could weep with strong crying and tears for deliverance from the death that lay before Him (v. 7).

(*b*) If the high priest of the Old Covenant was not only liable to temptation, but to the sinful infirmity which underlay the temptations given therewith (v. 2, vii. 28), this enabled him, on the one hand, in quite a special way to have sympathy with the infirmities of his brethren; but it prevented him, on the other hand, from being a perfect priest, according to § 115, *c*. But in the High Priest of the New Covenant, not only was that sympathy surely provided for by His capacity to suffering and temptation, but He was also holy and undefiled (*ὅσιος, ἄκακος, ἀμίαντος*; comp. ix. 14: *ἄμωμος*); and by His exaltation to heaven, He is completely separated from sinners and all defilement by their sins, while the separation of the Old Testament high priest from the people remained always external and imperfect (vii. 26). He was tried, but without sin (iv. 15); which means not only that He conquered the temptation, but also that no sinful impulses of His own moved Him (comp. Gess, p. 431). On His entrance into the world He declared it to be the funda-

[4] The context shows that it is not in the least important here to describe the extent of the human nature which was peculiar to Him, or to indicate the transition from the (impersonal) pre-existence to the historical existence, as Beyschlag, p. 198, supposes, but simply to note that He has taken this mortal body so as to fulfil the object of His calling, which required death (*ἵνα διὰ τοῦ θανάτου*). On account of the difference of the meaning of *σάρξ* with Paul, Rom. viii. 3 cannot without more ado be co-ordinated with ii. 14, as Riehm, p. 388, does; and quite as little can *ἐν ὁμοιώματι ἀνθρώπων* (Phil. ii. 7) be co-ordinated with ii. 17, as here complete similarity, *i.e.* equality (as ix. 21), has to be thought of. But really the *σάρξ* of Christ is naturally even with Paul subject to suffering and death (§ 78, *c*). The way in which *παθεῖν* readily stands for death itself (ix. 26, xiii. 12; comp. ii. 9: *τὸ πάθημα τοῦ θανάτου*) reminds one of Peter (comp. § 49, *a*).

mental principle of His life to do the will of God (x. 7, 9, after Ps. xl. 8, 9); and although He was the Son, yet has He learned obedience as every man (v. 8), while He withstood the ever harder trials which suffering imposed on Him (ver. 7). He was faithful to His calling (ii. 17, iii. 2), and trusted in God (ii. 13); for as the Leader in the succession of the company of believers, He has carried faith to perfection in His life, while He endured the actual contradiction of sinners and the shame of the cross (comp. vi. 6, xiii. 12, 13), in view of the joy set before Him (xii. 2, 3 : ὁ τῆς πίστεως ἀρχηγὸς καὶ τελειωτής).[5] Thus, it became God to perfect Him through suffering (ii. 10), *i.e.* to lead Him to that moral perfection which, according to ver 9, procured for Him the heavenly crown. For only after He was perfected by the learning of that obedience, whose crowning-point was the endurance of the death of the cross, could He, as a perfect priest, become the author of eternal redemption (v. 9); while, in contrast to the human priests, compassed with infirmity, He was for ever the perfect Son of God (vii. 28).[6]

[5] To be sure, it is, in the first place, the need to show the requisites of a perfect high priest in Christ, which gives occasion to the author to enter upon the earthly human life of Christ in its different bearings. Perhaps the importance of this was to remove the offence which the readers took to the lowly and suffering form of Christ (comp. § 111, *a*), and by detailing to them the essential requisites for His Messianic calling, to show them the inner necessity of that form. But his expositions on this point show plainly that there existed to him richer materials of suggestive details from the life of Jesus than to the Apostle Paul (§ 78, *a*), and these he can have drawn only from the traditions of the early apostles. If it is clear, not necessarily from his repeated account of the temptation of Christ, that therewith the history of the temptation from the oldest tradition flitted before his mind, it is also overwhelmingly likely that v. 7 refers to the scene at Gethsemane. It is especially indicated in the repeated reference to His being proved as a pattern in obedience and faith, a proof sinless though carried to perfection, that the proclamation of Jesus' sinlessness by the early apostles, resting on their own intercourse with Him, was present to Him (§ 46, *d*) otherwise than it was to the Apostle Paul (comp. even the expression xiii. 12 and the passage ii. 9, according to the explanation to be given, § 124, *a*, footnote 3).

[6] The perfecting of the sinless Son of God could not naturally consist, as in the case of sinful men (§ 115, *c*), in a cleansing from the stains of sin, but only in the verification of His moral perfection under the greatest trials. And so a modification of the idea of τελείωσις inevitably arises from its different applications, and there is no ground for the objection of Pfleiderer (p. 346, footnote [E. T. ii. 74]). He appears, moreover (p. 344 [E. T. ii. 73]), to apply the idea in the case of Christ, not, as in the case of Christians, exclusively to the future

(*c*) As a second necessity for the high-priesthood, the author mentions, that one must not take this honour to oneself, but must be called thereto, as was Aaron (v. 4). For, conformably with this, the Levitical priesthood was called *κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Ἀαρών* (vii. 11). Even so, Christ did not raise Himself to this honour—to be called a high priest—by His own power, but by God Himself, who had declared Him to be His Son, and worthy of the honour appropriate to the Son, was He expressly called in the (Messianic, as formerly pointed out) Psalm cx. (ver. 4) to be High Priest, after the order of Melchisedec (v. 5, 6), and as such was He greeted (ver. 10). There is then taken into view, for the Messianic age, a change of the former priestly order (vii. 11, 12); for Jesus is not sprung from the tribe of Levi (and so not called *κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Ἀαρών*), but from the tribe of Judah, to which the Mosiac law ascribed no priestly prerogative (vv. 13, 14). There is, however, in this no encroachment on the part of the tribe of Judah on the rights of the tribe of Levi; for Jesus is called not as a descendant of Judah's, but after the order of Melchisedec.[7] There was rather thereby removed the imperfection which clung to the Aaronic priesthood, so far as it rested on a carnal commandment (ver. 16), *i.e.* connected the priesthood with natural descent, and thus constituted mortal men priests (§ 115, *c*). For as Melchisedec, who, in the scriptural account, has neither father nor mother, nor, generally, any genealogy (ver. 3: *ἀγένεα λόγητος*), did not become a priest in virtue of the rule of a carnal commandment (ver. 16: *οὐ κατὰ νόμον ἐντολῆς σαρκίνης*), which in

δοξάζεσθαι, an application for which none of the three passages gives any occasion. In particular, the *τελειωθείς* (v. 9) cannot take up the *εἰσακουσθείς* (ver. 7), as the latter refers not at all to the resurrection (comp. Gess, p. 432), but can only indicate the result of His learning obedience (ver. 8); and vii. 28, the contrast to the *ἀσθένεια* shows that it is the conquering of every temptation resulting from human weakness which is referred to, which works the abiding condition of a perfection raised above such weakness. But to include the moral perfection, and the exaltation in the idea, as Riehm, p. 432 f., and Gess, p. 435, do, seems to me quite inadmissible.

[7] That this is a higher order of priesthood is clear from this, that Melchisedec received tithes from Abraham himself, while the Levitical priests receive tithes only from Abraham's descendants (vii. 4–7), and being mortal men only during their lifetime (ver. 8), and that even Melchisedec in Abraham, whose son Levi was, in a way tithed the receiver of tithes (ver. 9), as the latter was then in the loins of his father.

some way connected the priesthood with his family; so Christ also is a priest of a different order, *κατὰ τὴν ὁμοιότητα Μελχισεδέκ*, just on this account, that He became so *κατὰ δύναμιν ζωῆς ἀκαταλύτου, i.e.* in virtue of an endless life (vv. 15, 16). Such a priesthood, to be sure, Jesus had not in virtue of His original nature, as, according to note *a*, He was made like His brethren, and had received their mortal body; but in virtue of the *πνεῦμα αἰώνιον*, which was in His flesh (ix. 14), and communicated to Him that indestructible life which enabled Him in His high-priestly calling to suffer death, and yet to live on as the eternal High Priest.[8]

(*d*) As the Old Covenant set up mortal priests, the priesthood must have been constantly changing, passing from one to another (vii. 23). This imperfection, too, which clung to the Levitical priesthood, is removed in the New Covenant, as Melchisedec, in the typical representation of Scripture, which speaks neither of the end of his life, nor the termination of his priesthood, lives (vii. 8) and abides a priest *εἰς τὸ διηνεκές* (ver. 3); so also the Messianic High Priest (Ps. cx. 4), corresponding to this order of Melchisedec, is designated as *ἱερεὺς εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα* (vii. 17, vi. 20). He has therefore the priesthood as one, which passes no more from one to another (vii. 24: *ἀπαράβατον*). The passage from the Psalm shows this also in this way, that God confirmed the priesthood to Him with an oath, such as does not occur in the case of the Levitical high priest (vv. 20, 21; comp. ver. 28); and this oath shows, according to its nature (comp. vi. 16, 17), the divine purpose, which sets up the High Priest of the New

[8] Here, therefore, as in the preaching of the early apostles (§ 48, *c*) and in Paul (§ 78, *d*), the higher side of Christ's Being in His earthly human life, in virtue of which He did not enter by death into the shadowy life of Hades, but by the resurrection (xiii. 20) into the eternal heavenly life, is the eternal, and therefore the Divine Spirit, by which it is not clear whether it was received by Him at His baptism, or is regarded as a constitutive factor of His Being. To be sure, the Spirit (ix. 14) is designated not as the Spirit of God, but only as eternal according to its (divine) quality; but to think thereby, with Riehm (p. 526), of a human *πνεῦμα*, which carries in itself the divine attribute of eternity, corresponds, no doubt, with the dogmatic idea of a divine human nature of Christ, but scarcely with the mode of thought in the Epistle to the Hebrews. Against the misconstruction of von Hofmann, according to which the indissoluble life and the eternal Spirit are to be spoken of the exalted Christ, comp. Gess, p. 446 f.

Covenant as an unchangeable one; therefore the covenant, whose surety He has become, must be unchangeable, and hence better than the old, which has to be in the end removed as insufficient (vii. 22). But His sinlessness also (note *b*) fits Him for uninterrupted priestly functions, in so far as He is never required on account of His own sins to interrupt the discharge of His duties for others, in order just to exercise them in His own behalf, and it guarantees Him a continuous, and, so far, an unchangeable priesthood (vii. 26–28). But, above all, by means of His eternally abiding priesthood, He is enabled thoroughly to deliver us, because He ever lives to make intercession for us (ver. 25). The intercession of Christ (comp. Rom. viii. 34) is here, therefore, conformably with the fundamental idea of the author, regarded as a priestly function, by which He mediates continuously for us access to God (*τοὺς προσερχομένους δι' αὐτοῦ*), and presents continuously our thankofferings before God (xiii. 15 : *δι' αὐτοῦ ἀναφέρωμεν θυσίαν αἰνέσεως*).

§ 120. *The High Priest in the Holiest.*

By His exaltation to heaven, Christ has perfected the specific high-priestly function, while He has entered into the archetypal Holiest of all (*a*). Dwelling there with the angels in the heavenly city of God, as the Ruler of the Messianic world, He is raised infinitely above them, as the ministering servants of the pre-Messianic age (*b*). In this His heavenly exaltation Christ is an eternal King, although to our author His kingly activity ever runs back into His priestly (*c*). Yet this kingly activity, although it corresponds with His original divine nature, is regarded as a trust committed to Him by God (*d*).

(*a*) Although in the passages looked at, § 119, regarding the priesthood of Christ, He is already repeatedly designated High Priest, there yet lies nothing in them specifically to qualify Him as High Priest. That is to say, what specifically distinguishes the high priest of the Old Covenant from the other Levitical priests, is that he alone goes once a year into the Holiest, in order to effect the purification of the people (ix. 6, 7 ; comp. ver. 25). If Jesus has become a real High

Priest, and not a priest only, He too must have gone into the Holiest (εἰς τὸ ἐσώτερον τοῦ καταπετάσματος: vi. 19, 20). But the Holiest of the tabernacle was not the dwelling-place of God Himself, but only, according to Ex. xxv. 40 (comp. Acts vii. 44), a copy of God's heavenly dwelling,[1] which He had shown to Moses on the Mount (viii. 5; comp. ix. 23: τὰ ὑποδείγματα τῶν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς); and it is shown from this side that the Old Testament priestly service, which was consecrated for this, could be but an imperfect and shadowy service (comp. § 115, *c*). But Christ, forasmuch as He, according to § 118, *a*, sits on the right hand of the Majesty in the heavens, is now λειτουργός in the heavenly Holiest (ver. 2), is gone into heaven itself (ix. 24), where He is now a greater Priest, who has been set over the house of God (x. 21: ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον τοῦ Θεοῦ). Hence, that this exaltation to heaven, which moreover need not, ix. 12, be regarded as the visible ascension, as Riehm (p. 347) supposes, inasmuch as it is there represented as an entrance once for all into the Holiest, designates Christ perfectly as a High Priest, it is made clear why, in the method of teaching in our Epistle, conversely with Paul's practice, the resurrection of Christ, mentioned only xiii. 20, recedes so much behind His exaltation to heaven. By that is perfectly proved for the first time His equality with, and also His superiority to, the high priest of the Old Covenant, in contradistinction to the priests generally.[2]

[1] According to Old Testament representation, heaven is God's very dwelling (Ps. xi. 4, xviii. 7, xxix. 9; Mic. i. 2; Heb. ii. 20), or, according to the idea of several heavens (comp. 2 Cor. xii. 2; Eph. iv. 10, and, along with these, § 103, *d*, footnote 7), the heavenly Holiest above all heavens, which form, as it were, His Holy Place and the Holiest of all. These lower heavenly spaces which Christ passed through at His exaltation (iv. 14), and in comparison with which He has become ὑψηλότερος (vii. 26), are expressly designated (ix. 11) as the greater and more perfect tabernacle (Holy Place) not made with hands, which does not even belong to this earthly creation (οὐ ταύτης τῆς κτίσεως). On the contrary, the highest heaven is itself (ver. 24) put in opposition to the Holiest made with hands (τὰ ἅγια in an imminent sense, as ix. 8, and oftener), and this latter is spoken of only as ἀντίτυπα τῶν ἀληθινῶν (ἁγίων, comp. ver. 12), and, ver. 1, τὸ ἅγιον κοσμικόν, while the heavenly Holy Place and the real σκηνή God Himself, and not man, set up (viii. 2). This real Old Testament representation also has throughout nothing to do with the Alexandrian κόσμος νοητός (Pfleiderer, p. 328 [E. T. ii. 55]).

[2] Riehm has rightly rejected the view represented yet by Messner (pp. 297, 299, 302) and Schenkel (p. 335), according to which Christ's high-priesthood

(*b*) By His entrance into the Holiest, the Mediator of the New Covenant (xii. 24) has become a dweller in the heavenly city of God (ver. 22; comp. § 117, *d*), in which is the heavenly Holiest, as the earthly was in the earthly Jerusalem. There dwell with Him the myriads, *i.e.* the innumerable festal company of the angels, praising God with eternal joy (xii. 22, 23). But as His name πρωτότοκος or υἱός already of itself indicates, that according to His nature He is raised far above these His fellows (i. 4–6; comp. § 118, *b*), so has He also by His sitting at the right hand of God attained a position of dignity infinitely above them (vv. 3, 4), as the first apostles (§ 50, *a*; comp. § 19, *d*), agreeing with Paul (§ 104, *a*), teach. While He has attained to equal honour and dominion with God, the angels are servants (λειτουργοί), whom God uses in His activities in nature, while He turns them into winds and flames of fire (ver. 7, after Ps. civ. 4).[3] They are ministering spirits (πνεύματα λειτουργικά), but their highest end consists in this, that they serve God in that work of His that has the deliverance of men for its end (ver. 14). In this service they have already mediated the giving of the law (ii. 2; comp. § 115, *b*), and in ii. 5 one may find the idea current in Palestinian theology set forth (comp. Riehm, p. 656), that the pre-Messianic ages, which had for their purpose the

begins with His entrance into the Holiest (comp. also Gess, p. 460). The passage viii. 4, 5 says only that the typical Holy Place on the earth has its own priests, and therefore Christ could exercise His functions only in another, the heavenly (ver. 2); but it does not exclude the idea that He already executed priestly, nay, even high-priestly, functions *outside the Holy Place*. His entrance into the Holiest of all is only that high-priestly function of Christ by which His high-priesthood as such is definitely proved; but He is essentially constituted a high priest (v. 4–6), and as such He has already exercised its functions in the offering of Himself (comp. Riehm, p. 477). It is, on the other hand, a mistake when Riehm asserts that He first became a high priest after the order of Melchisedec (p. 479) by His exaltation. There is nothing in the typical Melchisedec which refers to an entrance into the Holiest, and therefore to the high-priesthood, in contradistinction to the priesthood; and therefore the ἱερεύς, in the passage from the Psalm (cx. 4), is to be taken in different applications. The point of an indissoluble life, and of the possibility thereby of an eternal priesthood, borrowed, according to § 119, *c*, from the figure of Melchisedec, would require only the resurrection, not the ascension to heaven. But the τελείωσις (v. 9, vii. 28) has nothing whatever to do either with the Melchisedec priesthood or with the ascension to heaven (comp. § 119, *b*, footnote 6).

[3] If Beyschlag, p. 197, draws conclusions from this as to the impersonal

preparation for the σωτηρία, were put in subjection to them, in so far as everything which God did during those ages was mediated by their ministry. They have no share in the salvation mediated by Christ (ii. 16), because as inhabitants of the heavenly city of God (xii. 22) they need it not; and as the Messianic age is exalted infinitely above the pre-Messianic, so naturally is the Lord of the one (ii. 5) exalted infinitely above God's servants in the other. This will be perfectly manifested when at His return, which will also be accompanied with a retinue of angels (§ 19, *d*; 64, *a*), the angels of God worship Him (i. 6).

(*c*) As the heavenly Holiest is at the same time the throne-room of God, where He, as the Universal Ruler, has His seat (iv. 16), the entrance of Christ into it is at the same time His elevation to the throne of God (viii. 1, xii. 2). If, now, it is said in the promise (Ps. cx. 1), which here, as § 19, *c*, 39, *b*, is applied directly to Christ, that the Messiah must sit at the right hand of God till He has made all His enemies His footstool (i. 13), our author does not understand this, according to the earlier Epistles of Paul (§ 90, *c*), of a fixed time, at which the redemptive rule of the Messiah shall come to an end,[4] but His dominion is an everlasting dominion (i. 8, after Ps. xlv. 7), as in the later Epistles of Paul (comp. § 103, *b*;

nature of angels (comp. § 118, *d*, footnote 10), he mistakes the meaning of this idea, which is, moreover, peculiar to Palestinian Judaism (comp. Riehm, p. 656). In the rabbinical passages brought forward by commentators, this change refers simply to forms of manifestation, which with spirits may naturally be changed, inasmuch as they as such have no form for manifestation. But if through these changes the variety of nature's appearances are called forth, then no doubt it is clear that the unchangeable, which itself evokes all created nature and its great changes (i. 10, 12), must be infinitely exalted above it. The comparison with them may be intended to set forth now the superiority of the New Covenant Mediator over the Old Covenant (comp. Riehm, p. 303), or it may be specially directed against the tendency of the readers to set Christ on a level with the angels, and the law mediated through their ministry on an equality with His word and work as regards abiding significance (comp. Baur, p. 236); it is ever of service for this end to make manifest the superiority of the covenant mediated by Him.

[4] According to x. 12, 13, Christ sits εἰς τὸ διηνεκές at the right hand of God, and waits till the promise of the Psalm be fulfilled, yet without coming therewith to the end of His reign. Not yet, that is to say, is everything subject to Him (ii. 8), as, though the Messianic time has come, the Messianic perfection has not yet come (§ 117, *d*). But as a part of the other prophecy which promises this subjection (Ps. viii. 5–7) has been already fulfilled, ver. 9,

110, *b*). The eternal High Priest has at the same time royal honours, and here now the typical figure of Melchisedec suggests yet another point of comparison; for Melchisedec was not only priest of the Most High God, but also king of Salem (vii. 1), and his name is expressly explained as "king of righteousness," or "king of peace" (ver. 2). Yet this point in the figure of the priest-king is never directly applied to Christ, however closely it may lie in his way, as *e.g.* viii. 1. Behind the idea, ruling his whole doctrinal view of the priesthood of Christ, which was the specific expression for His Messianic calling, the idea of Christ's kingship must necessarily recede, as it is employed only to bring from this side into view the elevation of the New Testament High Priest over the Aaronic (viii. 1).[5]

(*d*) As the personal activity of the Son in the creation and founding of the theocracy, according to § 118, *d*, is not to prejudice the idea of God as the ultimate Author, so the activity of Christ in the conquering of the world (i. 12, according to the Messianic interpretation of Ps. cii. 27) does not exclude the fact that it is God's work (comp. xii. 26, 27), and God alone continues as the end of the world (ii. 10: δι' ὃν τὰ πάντα). But, on the whole, in spite of all emphasizing in our Epistle of the original divine nature of the Son, Monotheism is already preserved in this way, that it is God who has raised Him, as § 39, *c*, 50, *a*, to a position of divine dignity, while He has made Him heir of all (i. 2), and put all things under Him (i. 13, x. 13, ii. 8);[6] as God has also raised Him from the

security is thereby given for its complete fulfilment (ver. 8), which leaves no room for any other rule over the οἰκουμένη μέλλουσα (ver. 5) than His. According to Schenkel, p. 339, to be sure, the eternity of the high-priesthood of Christ is not to be taken literally.

[5] The Son exalted to heaven is on that account a great High Priest (iv. 14), who rules with royal almighty power over the heavenly dwelling of God (x. 21). Just as He, as High Priest of coming good things, obtains for the people the blessings of the Messianic time (ix. 11), so does He this also as the great Shepherd of the sheep (xiii. 20), *i.e.* as Leader of the perfected theocracy (ii. 5, iii. 6; comp. 1 Pet. v. 4, and therewith § 50, *a*); and as He as such mediates for Christians every gracious activity of God which fits them for fulfilling His will (xiii. 21), so the abiding help He gives them in their trials (ii. 18) appears in such close connection with His high-priestly activity (v. 17), that in this way also it is clear, how to the author Christ's royal activity ever refers back again to His priestly.

[6] One must not put a reflex sense into the intransitive ἱκάθισεν, by which His

dead (iii. 20), and prepares for Him His return (i. 6). Even when He is addressed as God, God is yet designated as His God, who has anointed Him to be King (ver. 9). As, then, this position of divine dignity, according to § 118, quite corresponded to His nature as the divine Son, and, since His appearance on the earth was but temporary, a humiliation imposed on Him with a view to the discharge of His calling as Messiah (§ 111, *a*), that dignity must accordingly be given Him *à priori* after the fulfilment of that calling, yet it is represented in our Epistle as the reward of the patience and the faith He showed on earth (xii. 2). God has crowned Him for the suffering of death (ii. 9, after Ps. viii. 6), or for the sake of His righteousness (i. 9, after Ps. xlv. 8), with honour and glory, as He Himself endured death for the joy set before Him (xii. 2). Once put under the conditions of an earthly life, He must, in conformity with the fundamental principle of the divine retribution, earn for Himself, as all men have to do, His future glory. Only that He must earn this directly by the suffering of death, lay in the destination of His human life (ii. 9: *διὰ τὸ πάθημα τοῦ θανάτου . . . ὅπως ὑπὲρ παντὸς γεύσηται θανάτου*); and that He won *this* divine glory was grounded in this, that it corresponded to His original nature.[7]

elevation to the right hand of God is repeatedly expressed (i. 3, viii. 1, x. 12, xii. 2), as though He Himself assumed this place of honour. It is expressly stated how He made not Himself, but God made Him, to be *ἀπόστολος καὶ ἀρχιερεύς* (v. 4, 5, iii. 1–3); and even the way in which, § 118, *c*, His nature as to its origin is characterized, preserves Monotheism in the most definite way. Hence one must not conclude, with Schenkel, p. 324, that all that is said about the pre-existence of Christ has only an "ideal significance."

[7] One needs only to compare the way in which Paul, Phil. ii., conceives this exaltation at least at the same time as the reward for the prehistoric act of self-humiliation (§ 103, *d*), to see here also how the christological expressions of our author are throughout conditioned by a vigorous impression of the proclamation of the historical life of Christ (comp. § 119, *b*, footnote 5).

CHAPTER III.

THE SACRIFICE OF THE NEW COVENANT.

§ 121. *The Sacrificial Death of Christ.*

Messiah's offering of Himself in His death on the cross is the sacrifice, which is well-pleasing to God, perfect (*a*). But this perfect sacrifice, according to its nature, is offered once for all, because it renders any repetition of it unnecessary and impossible (*b*). The death of Christ more especially corresponds to the sacrifice on the great Day of Atonement, the blood of which the high priest carried into the Holiest (*c*). But in the most complete way is His sacrifice the antitype of the covenant sacrifice, which was offered at the setting up of the covenant (*d*).

(*a*) The specific duty of the priesthood is the offering of sacrifice (v. 1, viii. 3). As, then, the sacrifices of the Old Covenant were imperfect (§ 115, *c*), the New Covenant required better sacrifices (ix. 23). But Messiah has already announced, Ps. xl. 7–9, that He comes not to offer the ordinary sacrifices, which are not well-pleasing to God, but to do God's will (x. 5–7), and He has thereby taken away the imperfect animal sacrifices (ver. 4) of the Old Testament law (vv. 8, 9). But that it is not thereby in any way meant, that in place of the animal sacrifices God required the life obedience of Messiah, is clear from ver. 10, according to which God's will turns on the προσφορὰ τοῦ σώματος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. According to the meaning which the author gives to the passage from the Psalm, God has prepared for Messiah a body (ver. 5), in order that He may offer it in sacrifice. This offering of Himself by Messiah is hence the sacrifice which is really well-pleasing to God; and the highest demand of the Levitical sacrifice, blamelessness (ix. 14: ἄμωμος), was not wanting to it, because He presented Himself as the sinless One. If, ix. 14, it is said that He offered Himself διὰ πνεύματος αἰωνίου, it is evidently meant by that, that Jesus, only as one who in virtue of this πνεῦμα possessed a life

quite independent of the body required by God in sacrifice, *i.e.* of His bodily life—an indissoluble life (§ 119, *c*)—could of His own accord offer that life to God in sacrifice.[1] Such is the idea of the death of Christ on the cross as a sin-offering (§ 100, *c*), prepared for in the earlier Epistles of Paul, but worked out thoroughly only in the Epistles of the Imprisonment, come to full validity here on the ground of the complete view of the priestly character of the Messianic calling in our Epistle.

(*b*) With the imperfection of the Old Testament sacrifices is intimately connected, according to § 115, *c*, this fact, that it needed ever to be repeated; for when the object of the sacrifice has been attained, it is self-evident that there is no more need for a προσφορὰ περὶ ἁμαρτίας (x. 18). But Christ, by His offering once for all, or by the offering of His body on the cross (ver. 14; comp. ver. 10), by which He made sacrifice for sin (ver. 12), has attained that purpose, which the Old Testament sacrifices could not attain (comp. ix. 9, x. 1), and there is hence no more need for ever to repeat this self-offering, as the high priests of the Old Covenant offered theirs (vii. 27). It cannot be, also, on this account, since each man dies but once (ix. 27), and therefore the offering presented by His death (ver. 26) can never be repeated (ver. 28). It is clear, moreover, from the connection of x. 14 with vv. 10, 12, as from ix. 26–28, that that single act of self-offering was conclusively perfected by the death on the

[1] This is not, to be sure, to be so understood as though only a life yet existing in spite of death could be offered to God (comp. Riehm, pp. 525, 526); for the (bodily-earthly) life surrendered in death, and so offered in sacrifice, was by no means an indissoluble life (vii. 16), which Jesus had in Himself in virtue of His eternal Spirit; rather that life of His vanished really with the blood which streamed out in death; and if His life, like the human spirit life, had been connected with the soul which dwelt in the blood (comp. § 27, *c*), then He could not have surrendered Himself without therewith giving up the condition of all further priestly activity, as the spirit of man, or the soul, separated from the body, has but an impotent shadowy life. Only one who in virtue of this spirit possesses a different, an indissoluble life, could dispose of himself (*i.e.* his bodily-earthly life) for a sacrificial offering, without depriving himself therewith of any further priestly activity, which found its conclusion only by the entrance into the holiest (ix. 12). Neither is the eternal Spirit thereby regarded as the means of atonement (as Baur, p. 237, supposes), nor does it refer to the obedience of Christ (as Ritschl, ii. p. 335, will have it); yet this latter certainly, according to x. 5 f., conditioned the acceptableness of His sacrifice.

cross, as also, vii. 27, *ἐφάπαξ, ἑαυτὸν ἀνενέγκας* is put parallel with *ἀναφέρειν θυσίας*, but not with carrying the blood into the Holiest.[2]

(*c*) Already the consideration of the offering of Christ, as done once for all, leads the author to the analogy of the sacrifice offered once a year on the great Day of Atonement. But as Christ is set forth as the High Priest of the New Covenant, then, His sacrifice must be looked at under the type of this specific sacrifice of the high priest. As this sacrifice, according to Lev. xvi. 15, had to be killed by the high priest himself, so the perfect High Priest had to offer Himself on the cross, and to this is attached the typical realization of the function attached to the high priest alone, for which, according to § 120, *a*, the entrance of the true High Priest into the heavenly Holiest presents the point of contact.[3] That is to say, as in the Old Covenant, the atoning point of the sacrificial act lies in the outpouring of the blood, and the presentation of the blood on the altar, or in the Holiest, is the symbolical presentation of a perfect atonement,[4] so that presentation of the blood of Christ in the Holiest has for its object simply to make valid before God for our

[2] The *ἅπαξ* in Rom. vi. 9, 10, 1 Pet. iii. 18, presents, moreover, no special parallel to this once offering of Christ (as Riehm, pp. 635–651, supposes), as in the one case only the thought of dying again is therewith warded off, and in the other case the uniqueness of the death suffered *περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν* is brought into prominence, as contrasted with the sufferings of the righteous like it in other respects; while in our Epistle the *ἐφάπαξ* is the expression for the perfect sufficiency of the one sin-offering of Christ. The passage in Peter stands much nearer this thought than does that of Paul (comp. § 49, *b*).

[3] The function which the high priest discharged in the Holiest is designated, to be sure, in ix. 7 as a *προσφέρειν*; but this presentation of the blood in the Holiest is distinguished in the most marked way from the offering of sacrifice outside (comp. note *b*). The presentation of His blood is nowhere designated as the offering of Himself on the part of Christ, as Riehm (p. 476) and Gess (p. 459 f.) nevertheless assert, nor is it reckoned as such. For the *προσφέρειν ἑαυτόν*, ix. 14, in no way designates the presentation of the blood in the Holiest, but rather the worth of the blood to be brought into heaven (ver. 12) is estimated in ver. 14 by this, that it was the blood of Him who offered Himself as a sacrifice, and that can only refer to His giving Himself on the cross. The emphasis lies, as the position of *ἑαυτόν* before expressly indicates, on this point, the offering of Himself. The idea of a new offering of Himself in heaven, which will then refer back to an altogether different guarantee for the consecration of His brethren by means of His heavenly activity (Gess, p. 469), is one quite foreign to the Epistle to the Hebrews.

[4] Only in so far as atonement has been already made by blood-shedding can

comfort the salvation obtained by His sacrifice. But even because it was not the blood of others, as was that by which the high priest entered year by year (ix. 25), but because He entered by means of His own blood (ver. 12), which, as the blood of the perfect sacrifice, had an efficacy which excludes any repetition, so was it done once for all (*ἐφάπαξ*) by this entrance. He needed not, as the Old Testament high priest, by His entrance ever afresh to take into view a sacrificial offering repeated annually (ver. 25: *οὐδ' ἵνα πολλάκις προσφέρῃ ἑαυτόν*), which might compensate for the imperfection of each single occasion, but He could appear in the presence of God for our benefit (comp. vi. 20, 24), in order there to obtain the removal of all guilt at once (ver. 26).[5]

(*d*) The only sacrifice in the Old Covenant which really could not be repeated (ix. 19, 20; comp. Ex. xxiv.) was that offered at the institution of that covenant. If, now, Christianity is set forth as a New Covenant, which is to be grounded on the setting up of a perfect atoning institute, nothing is easier than to see in the perfect sacrifice, on which it is based, the covenant sacrifice of the New Covenant (comp. § 49, *c*). Wherefore, because Christ with the blood of a perfect atoning

the blood, according to ix. 7, 12, 25, mediate for the high priest an entrance into the Holiest. So long as sin was not thereby atoned for, the unclean representative of an unclean people could not appear before the presence of God. Even on that account had he for himself, as for the people, to offer a sacrifice (v. 3, vii. 27), and to carry its blood into the Holiest (ix. 7). Were one to press this analogy, one might say that even Christ, who as the representative of sinful humanity had made their interests His own, could appear in the presence of God only in virtue of atoning blood (comp. Riehm, p. 541). But this idea, according to which Christ identifies Himself with sinners themselves, rests on a mistaken interpretation of the Old Testament idea of sin-bearers (comp. § 49, *b*), and is entirely foreign to the New Testament. Finally, the comparison of the prayer offered up in Gethsemane with the sacrifice the high priest offers for himself (Gess, p. 463 f.) is purely artificial.

[5] It is hence in no way implied in this passage that He has offered *Himself* in heaven (comp. footnote 3), but only that He, like every high priest, must have something to offer (viii. 3, 4), because without blood the high priest even on the great Day of Atonement must not enter the Holiest (ix. 7). But while the latter entered with the blood of others, there was thereby, as it were, a twofold substitution, because he made valid an atonement effected not by himself. With a special reference, moreover, the author makes the most of the type of the ritual on the great Day of Atonement, inasmuch as the bodies of the animals whose blood the high priest brought into the Holiest were burned without the camp, and hence Christ also suffered without the gate (xiii. 11, 12, and therewith § 115, *d*, footnote 11).

sacrifice has entered once for all into the Holiest (ver. 12), He is the Mediator of the New Covenant (ver. 15); and the author, vv. 19–25, expressly makes the blood with which Christ entered into the Holiest parallel with the blood of the Old Testament covenant sacrifice. Quite as Christ Himself in the words instituting the Supper (§ 22, *c*)—words which the author evidently assumes are known—He designates His blood as the blood of the covenant (x. 29), and Himself as He who, in virtue of the blood of an everlasting covenant, is the great Shepherd of the sheep (xiii. 20), so far as He has gone into the Holiest on the ground of the covenant sacrifice offered by His death, and there now (because He has been exalted to the right hand of God, x. 12), acting as King, He can obtain for the covenant people all the blessings of the New Covenant (comp. § 120, *c*, footnote 7). But that this covenant sacrifice is set forth here as merely instituting fellowship, Schenkel, p. 333, has not proved.

§ 122. *The Necessity of the Sacrificial Death of Christ.*

The death of Christ was necessary for the setting up of the New Covenant, whether one look upon it as a will of Christ's, which came into force only by the death of the Testator, or as a relation of fellowship with God, which was hindered by the guilt of the covenant people (*a*). The death of Christ, as an atoning sacrifice, has now removed the guilt, and therefore this hindrance is removed (*b*). But the sinner by this atonement has been delivered from the arrestment of guilt, in that Christ by His death has representatively borne the punishment of his guilt (*c*). In so far now as death lets the guilty sinner fall under the power of the devil, Christ has by His redemption stripped the devil of his power over men (*d*).

(*a*) With the view of the death of Christ being a sacrifice offered at the setting up of the New Covenant (§ 121, *d*), there is connected for our author the question, Why was this sacrificial death necessary? In the first place, he keeps in his eye the death of Christ simply as such. Significantly playing with the twofold meaning of the word διαθήκη, and, as in the idea of the blood of the covenant, thinking on the words of the institution of the Supper, he looks at the covenant established

by Christ as a will, by which Christians are become possessors of the covenant promise, which, according to § 115, *a*, comes to fulfilment only in the New Covenant (ix. 15). Now, as when a will comes in force, the death of the testator must first be confirmed (vv. 16, 17), so the death of Jesus is necessary in order that Christians may really take possession of the promise bequeathed to them by the New Covenant. By means of this *argumentum ad hominem*, the author wishes to make manifest, on the analogy of a human relation, the fact as natural, that the death of Christ was necessary for the realization of the highest end of the covenant. The special need of this, that a covenant sacrifice belongs to the setting up of a covenant, he explains by a reference to the setting up of the Old Covenant, which was done not without blood (ver. 18), in that the people and the holy things had to be sprinkled with the blood of the covenant sacrifice.[1] As, moreover, the sacrifice of institution of the New Covenant was at the same time the sacrifice of the great Day of Atonement, which the high priest brought into the Holiest (§ 121, *c*, *d*), so the archetypal holy things of the heavenly Holiest into which (ver. 23) Christ has gone, appear to be such as must be first cleansed from the stains of guilt. If the heavenly city of God, with its Holy Place, is conformably with the promise destined for the covenant people, that they may there attain to perfect fellowship with God (§ 117, *d*), then their guilt has defiled these holy things as well as the earthly, and they must be purified in the same way as the typical law appointed for the latter, only not by the blood of an imperfect, but of a perfect sacrifice (*κρείττοσιν θυσίαις*).[2]

[1] If, as the object of this, the cleansing required by the law is given, ix. 22, then the idea lying beneath this is, that even the holy things were stained by the guilt of the people (Lev. xvi. 16–19; comp. viii. 15); and before the holy God could dwell in the Holy Place, and have fellowship with the people, this impurity had first to be taken away by the cleansing blood of sacrifice. It is by this method of representation that the objective need of an atonement for sin on the part of God, who, as the Holy One, can have no fellowship with unclean men, is pictorially set forth; and this Pfleiderer, p. 342 [E. T. ii. 70], as well as Gess, p. 476, overlooks.

[2] The Mediator of the New Covenant cannot therefore be thought of as in the heavenly city without the blood of sprinkling, which, louder than the blood of Abel, cries for vengeance (Gen. iv. 10), proclaims that through its sprinkling the uncleanness produced by guilt is taken away (xii. 24). While

(*b*) But as to how far sacrificial blood has cleansing power, ix. 22 shows, when it is said, parallel with the statement, that without shedding of blood there is no remission. The whole atoning institute of the Old Covenant depends indeed upon the thought that, according to the gracious appointment of God, the blood of animals given to the people for sacrifice (Lev. xvii. 11) atones for sin, *i.e.* makes it capable of being forgiven. If the blood of animal sacrifices could not yet remove sin (x. 4, 11: ἀφαιρεῖν, περιελεῖν ἁμαρτίας), then that arose not from the impossibility of an atonement really removing sin by means of sacrificial blood, but only from the imperfection of the Old Testament means of atonement, which was only shadowy and typically prophetic (§ 115, *c*, *d*). Through the offering of Christ there is an actual ἀθέτησις ἁμαρτίας (ix. 26) effected; sin has lost the right and power to stain men from guilt, and thus to separate them from God, because it is atoned for. Even on that account must Christ be made like to His brethren, and in particular must He take their flesh and blood (ii. 14), in order by the outpouring of His own blood to atone for the sins of the people (ver. 17: ἱλάσκεσθαι τὰς ἁμαρτίας), and by the presentation of the same in the heavenly Holiest make this atonement valid before God (§ 121, *c*).[3]

(*c*) If the guilt contracted through sin, on the one hand, prevents God from establishing full fellowship with men, it, on

Paul accounts for the need for the death of Christ by the demand of the divine righteousness given in his fundamental presuppositions (§ 80, *c*), to our author it seems prefigured in the legal ordinance, according to which the sin-stains which separate God from men can be removed only by the blood of sacrifice.

[3] That the blood of Christ is the perfect means of atonement, our Epistle teaches in harmony with Paul (§ 80). But while with the latter the atonement effected by the death of Christ reconciles God, as with the removal of guilt the cause of His anger and hostility is removed, here the atonement removes the uncleanness of the heavenly Holy Place arising from guilt, an uncleanness which prevents God having fellowship with men (note *a*). Both modes of representation proceed from this, that without an atonement for sin, guilt is not taken away, but their difference rests ultimately on this ground, that with Paul every sin is regarded as worthy of death, because positively stirring up the wrath of God; with our author, on the contrary, every sin, for which atonement generally can be spoken of, is regarded as the stain of a sin of infirmity, which even in the Old Testament prevented the perfect realization of the covenant relation, whose forgiveness was even there intended, but on account of the imperfection of its atoning institute could be realized only in the New (§ 115). As to the

the other hand, prevents men from receiving the salvation promised in this fellowship. The latter thought lies evidently in ix. 15, according to which death is required for the redemption of the sins contracted under the first covenant, in order that its members may receive the covenant promise. It rests on this, that guilt makes punishment necessary, and the execution of the punishment stands in the way of obtaining the promise.[4] But Christ has even thus become the Mediator of the covenant, that He, in virtue of His own blood, has entered into the Holiest, having obtained a redemption eternally valid (through the shedding of His own blood, ver. 12). For if, according to the context of x. 26, 27, where there is no *θυσία περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν*, only a terrible expectation of judgment remains, it is clear that that sacrifice, because it atones for sin, at the same time delivers men from guilt, and removes the punishment which threatened them in the judgment. The Epistle to the Hebrews, moreover, by this punishment can only have referred to the death by which, in conformity with ordinary Bible teaching (comp. § 50, *d*; 57, *d*; 66, *d*), the divine punishment for sin was executed; and if it now, ii. 9, emphasizes the fact that Christ tasted death (in all its bitterness; comp. also § 124, *a*, footnote 3) for the good of each, there is then involved the thought that He has freed the others from this bitter consequence of sin, and therefore there is the idea of substitution. But sin-bearing, *i.e.* the

formula *ἱλάσκεσθαι τ. ἁμαρτ.*, which, according to Greek usage, translates the Hebrew כִּפֶּר, comp. Ritschl, ii. p. 209; Gess, p. 473. Yet the former accords, if, according to viii. 12 (after Jer. xxxi. 34), God in the New Covenant is gracious (*ἵλεως*) to unrighteousness, and remembers sins no more, with which, according to x. 17, 18, the *ἄφεσις τ. ἁμαρτιῶν* is given, and with that every need for a *προσφορὰ περὶ ἁμαρτίας* is taken away.

[4] Here then, in any case, it is an objective necessity for the death of Christ that is spoken of, the reason of which lies evidently enough in the context, and this Pfleiderer, pp. 340–342 [E. T. ii. 68–70], overlooks. Actually it is deliverance from guilt which is meant by *ἀπολύτρωσις*, quite as, with Paul (§ 80, *c*), a guilt occasioned by the *παραβάσεις*, threatened as they have been with the divine anger. One can admit, with Ritschl (ii. p. 221), that there is nowhere indicated in the Epistle to the Hebrews any reference to a *λύτρον* by which this is brought about; and therefore the Petrine redemption (really different otherwise) from the slavery of sin (§ 49, *d*; comp. § 108, *b*, footnote 5), and also the passage (which as a matter of fact points to the same thing) Mark x. 45 (§ 22, *c*), cannot be here compared. But in fact it here remains, that this self-surrender to death must be considered as an act which works this *ἀπολύτρωσις* (ix. 12).

removing of the severest consequences of sin, is expressly, ix. 28, indicated as the object of the sacrifice of Christ.[5]

(*d*) But the author undoubtedly, who regards death, ix. 27, with the judgment following immediately, as the general fate of men, has thought of death not as such, but in the results which it occasions to the sinner; and these, according to ii. 14, consist in this, that the devil is he who has power over death, and uses it as a means to deliver sinners over to the destruction under which he has himself fallen; but no notice is at the same time taken of the arraignment of the devil in the judgment (Gess, p. 476). It is certainly indicated by *διὰ τοῦ θανάτου* that the death of Christ as the guiltless One made him that had the power of death powerless, only in so far as the guiltiness of men, which drew death on them, gave to the devil the power to use it as the means for exercising his power over men to bring destruction on them. But this He could do, not only because He forms an exception to the law of the kingdom of death (Ritschl, ii. p. 254), but because this innocent death freed men from the guilt and punishment of sin (note *c*). Hence the redeemed are delivered, not from death, but from the fear of death, which kept them in lifelong bondage, so far as they need no more fear falling by death under the power of Satan (ver. 15).[6]

[5] The expression *εἰς τὸ πολλῶν ἀνενεγκεῖν ἁμαρτίας*, on the ground of the Old Testament *usus loquendi*, and in particular on that of the passage Isa. liii. 12, coinciding with it, as also in accordance with the practice of Peter (§ 49, *b*), can be taken only of the bearing of the punishment allotted to sin. The idea of an assumption of punishment, to be sure, is originally as foreign to the idea of sacrifice as is that of deliverance from punishment; but the author might make such a combination (to him quite peculiar), because he looked on Christ not only as sacrifice, but also as priest, who by giving Himself to the bitter suffering of death, not only offered the sacrifice for the atonement of sin appointed by God, but also took on Himself the punishment of sin in order to bear it in the room of sinners. There is no need, therefore, of the somewhat artificial explanation of Ritschl, ii. p. 285, who, moreover, mistakes the significance of sin-bearing.

[6] This view is essentially distinct from the doctrine of the Palestinian theology (comp. Riehm, p. 654), according to which the devil, if he is permitted by God, takes away life from those who have transgressed the law, even though it is perhaps allied to it. The devil is in no sense here looked at as the angel of death, as even Hahn, p. 373, assumes. But the Pauline view also, according to which the power of the devil is broken by the redemption wrought by Christ's death, is quite different; for this victory refers, according to § 104, *b*, to the dominion which the devil already wields over those confirmed in sin, and not to

§ 123. *The Effects of the Sacrificial Death of Christ.*

When the covenant people were sprinkled with the atoning blood of the covenant sacrifice, they were purified from the stains of guilt, and their consciences were delivered from the consciousness of guilt (*a*). This purification put them into an estate of holiness, in which alone man can become God's possession, and in which he has constantly to keep himself (*b*). But therewith is the perfection reached, which the complete realization of the covenant requires (*c*). Hence, also, the way into the Holiest is now opened, and that approach to God is made possible which is the condition of the true worship of God (*d*).

(*a*) If even the purifying effect of the blood of the New Testament covenant, ix. 23, is referred but to the heavenly things, which, after that sin has been atoned for by that blood, are purified from the stains of guilt clinging to them (§ 122, *a*), then the purification wrought by the sacrifice of Christ may also naturally be referred to the sinner himself; nay, on the supposition of the former cleansing, there is brought into view only the objective necessity in particular of the latter subjective cleansing. But as, ix. 22, *καθαρίζεται* is made identical in the parallel member of the sentence with *γίνεται ἄφεσις*, it is clear that the thought can be only of a deliverance from sin, a cleansing from the stains of sin, not a cleansing from its unholy power.[1] In conformity with this, purification from

that power of his to which they are subjected in death. Death as the doom of God's wrath, especially with Paul, conformably to the peculiarity of his doctrine of sin, referred to footnote 3, is even in itself, and without this co-operation of the devil, regarded as the punishment of sin, so that the judgment which follows it can only determine who abide in death, and who have been delivered from it; comp. Pfleiderer, p. 350 f. [E. T. ii. 78 f.], who goes wrong only in this, that he narrows the objective effect of the death of Christ only to this, while our statements present it rather in the sense of note *c*.

[1] The *usus loquendi* of the LXX. corresponds with this, to which the phraseology of our author conforms (comp. Riehm, p. 56), as also that of Paul, with whom *καθαρισμός* appears as the effect of baptism (Eph. v. 26; comp. § 101, *a*). In Acts xviii. 6, xx. 26, also, *καθαρός* means clear from guilt. Pfleiderer, p. 339 [E. T. ii. 67], has acknowledged this signification of *καθαρός*, and he, moreover, strikingly points out how the (moral) worship of God, mentioned ix. 14, as the *result* of a cleansed conscience, proves nothing to the contrary; while Gess, p. 474, mixes up again the moral cleansing; and Schenkel, p. 326, exclusively insists on it. If he, p. 337, footnote *b*, makes the cleansing referred to in ix. 14

sin is given, i. 3, as the special purpose of the appearing of Christ on the earth, which Christ has effected, and that, as the aorist shows, by a single act, namely by His own sacrificial death. But ordinarily it is this subjective cleansing that is thought of when the reference is to the conscience of one who has obtained deliverance from guilt. And thus to the carnal (Levitical) cleansing, which alone the Old Testament sacrifices could produce (ix. 13), stands opposed the cleansing of the conscience from dead works effected by the blood of Christ (ver. 14; § 115, *b*), as these dead works stain the conscience with the consciousness of guilt.[2] As the Old Testament covenant people were sprinkled with the (cleansing) blood of the covenant sacrifice (ix. 19; comp. Ex. xxiv. 8), so are Christians ῥεραντισμένοι by the blood of Christ (comp. 1 Pet. i. 2, and therewith § 49, *c*); but here also this sprinkling is more exactly referred to the heart, and the deliverance produced thereby from an evil conscience (x. 22: ἀπὸ συνειδήσεως πονηρᾶς); for the blood of sprinkling loudly proclaims the perfected atonement (xii. 24).

(*b*) That the idea of ἁγιάζειν stands in very close connection with that of cleansing, ix. 13 shows, where the ἁγιάζει is taken up in the parallel apodosis by καθαριεῖ, ver. 14.[3] What cleansing is to the subjective consciousness of the man, that ἁγιασμός is for his objective relation to God. Because a sin-

to be the consciousness of deliverance in principle from the dominion of sin, then that contradicts the uniform idea of συνείδησις (comp. § 115, *b*, footnote 5).

[2] According to x. 2, he who has been actually freed from the consciousness of the guilt of sin has no longer any συνείδησις ἁμαρτιῶν. There is a consciousness of past sins only when the sins have not yet been atoned for; for through atonement, or the forgiveness of sins which follows, the sins are really removed (§ 122, *b*). There is a consciousness of forgiven sins according to Bible phraseology, when the sins, along with the guilt which they contract, are regarded together, not that one may not, with Riehm, p. 566, distinguish between the consciousness of sin and the consciousness of guilt.

[3] But it follows even from this, that in ix. 13 cleansing cannot be designated as a result from ἁγιάζειν, as Riehm, p. 576, supposes, but that πρὸς τὴν τῆς σαρκὸς καθαρότητα designates only the relation in which the Old Testament means of atonement produced holiness (comp. for this signification of πρός, i. 7, ii. 17, iv. 13, v. 1, 14, vi. 11). Real holiness consists only in this, that one as regards purifying the flesh is consecrated for an (external) fellowship with God, but that only by the purification of the conscience is one made capable of the real (moral) worship of God (comp. footnote 1), and this he only can exercise who has been delivered from guilt, as Peter teaches (§ 49, *d*; comp. also § 81, *b*).

stained man cannot be consecrated to God for His possession, Christ by the cleansing blood of His sacrifice must first consecrate the covenant people (xiii. 12), and so make them fit for that relation of being God's, and of being in fellowship with Him, which corresponds to the perfect covenant relationship. This has taken place, in that Christians have once for all been consecrated by the sacrifice of the body of Christ (x. 10), or by the cleansing blood of the covenant (ver. 29); they are hence called ἅγιοι (iii. 1, vi. 10, xiii. 24).[4] For if Christians are exhorted to strive after holiness (xii. 14), *i.e.* after participation in the divine ἁγιότης (ver. 10; comp. § 45, *d*, footnote 6), the idea has no reference to positive moral perfection; what is said is, that the Christian, after he has once for all been put into the position of one cleansed from sin, a position which fits him to be of the family of God, has now laid on him the task of keeping himself in this position by avoiding fresh defilement from sin, as even that drawing near to God in the end, which leads to the vision of God, is naturally permitted only to those who are consecrated to God (ver. 14).

(*c*) If those, who have been sanctified by the sacrificial death of Christ (note *b*), have been for ever perfected by one offering (x. 14), it is clear that by the τελείωσις of the Christian cannot be understood moral perfection as by the τελείωσις of Christ (§ 119, *b*, footnote 6), as Schenkel, p. 331, will have it, but only the putting them completely, by the act of purification and sanctification once for all (comp. x. 2 with ver. 1), into the condition of that perfection, which fits for the realization of the covenant relation. Hence the idea very

[4] Riehm, p. 576, has not proved that this idea, which with our author bears exclusively an Old Testament stamp, includes in principle deliverance from the bondage of sin, as it does with Paul (comp. § 84, *d*). Neither in ii. 11 nor in x. 4 does he speak of one becoming increasingly holy, but in both places Christians are characterized, without reference to time, as such as have received from Christ, in the way above explained, consecration for the family of God. Compare the excellent exposition by Pfleiderer, p. 340 [E. T. ii. 68], but also Ritschl, ii. p. 211, and even Gess, p. 472; while Schenkel throughout thinks only of moral holiness. The realization of the Old Testament fundamental command (Lev. xi. 44) continues also here, as with Peter (§ 45, *d*), and in a certain sense also with Paul (§ 84, *d*), the goal of the Christian; but this goal can only then be striven after when he has been purified from the stains of sin, and consecrated to be the possession of God.

closely corresponds—a fact which Riehm, p. 641, misapprehends—with the Pauline idea of δικαίωσις (§ 82, *a*), only that the latter, conformably with the characteristic difference of the reciprocal fundamental point of view, refers to the putting into the state of δικαιοσύνη required by the law, the former to the putting into the state which was aimed at by the whole atoning agency of the Old Covenant, but never reached (ix. 9, x. 1, vii. 11, 19, and therewith § 115, *c*), the state of perfection necessary for perfect covenant relationship. As, therefore, with Paul, δικαίωσις is essentially identical with the not-reckoning or the forgiveness of sins, so, according to the connection of x. 14 with vv. 11, 18, τελείωσις is identical with the taking away or the forgiveness of sins.[5] And that it is so with τελείωσις in some degree, even as with the Pauline δικαίωσις, which is given directly with purification and sanctification even in the earthly present, is clear from this, that the conscience gives witness to the entrance of this perfection (ix. 9).

(*d*) By the τελείωσις one is put into the position of being well-pleasing to God, in which alone one can draw near to God, and this drawing near to God (xi. 6) is the condition of

[5] As, on the other hand, it does not follow from ii. 10 that the τελείωσις of Christ is something different from moral perfection, so neither does it follow that ἁγιασμὸς εἰς δόξαν belongs to the τελείωσις of the Christian, as Riehm, p. 581, yet supposes. Quite as little does it follow from xi. 39, 40, that participation in the covenant promise belongs to τελείωσις, as Riehm, p. 582, asserts. For if the believers of the Old Covenant did not obtain the promise even after their death, because God had prepared for those of the New Covenant something better, then the purpose-clause following shows how this better thing consisted in this, that the latter even during life obtained the τελείωσις, which made them fit to obtain directly the covenant promise given with the perfected covenant (comp. § 115, *a*). From this perfected salvation the others are not excluded, but they only, by means of the sacrifice of Christ, which God had kept in view for Messianic times, but which, according to ix. 26, had retrospective power, had to be conducted with those now living (xi. 40: μὴ χωρὶς ἡμῶν) to the perfection essential to it, and they have therefore had to wait so long for the fulfilment of the promise. But now, when the sacrifice has been offered, they are led on to perfection (xii. 23: δίκαιοι τετελειωμένοι), although they have not reached the consummation of salvation; and the idea of Riehm, pp. 584, 585, that they are perfected in another sense than the members of the New Covenant, is not only unfounded, but contrary to the evident intention of xi. 40. It is also a mistake when Pfleiderer, p. 346 [E. T. ii. 74], finds in this idea the Pauline δικαιοῦν along with the Pauline δοξάζειν. Ritschl, ii. p. 212, has caught the right idea.

all true worship of God. On this account, it was adduced as evidence of the imperfection of the Old Testament law, that it could not perfect those who drew near to God (*τοὺς προσερχομένους*), and that it could not provide for them a real entrance (x. 1).[6] By means of the perfect High Priest only can we draw near to God (vii. 25 : *τοὺς προσερχομένους δι' αὐτοῦ τῷ Θεῷ*); through Him can we offer sacrifices well-pleasing to God (xiii. 15, 16, and therewith § 119, *d*); only in consequence of the cleansing perfected by Him, can we worship the living God (*λατρεύειν*: ix. 14; comp. footnote 3) in the way well-pleasing to Him (xii. 28).[7] On the ground of the blood of His atoning sacrifice (*ἐν αἵματι Ἰησοῦ*) have we confidence as to the way into the Holiest, which He has consecrated for us, as one newly opened and livingly effectual, because really leading to the goal, a way which leads through the veil, which in the Old Covenant still prevented entrance into the Holiest (ix. 8).[8] On the other hand, Christ Himself has gone as our High Priest into the Holiest of the heavenly dwelling of God to make His atoning

[6] Even on this account the institution of the Holy Place, which prevented entrance into the Holiest, *i.e.* to God Himself, was a symbol of the Old Testament present (comp. § 117, *c*, footnote 3), in which the sacrifices could not perfect those who drew near to God in behalf of *λατρία* (*τὸν λατρεύοντα*), and so could not fit for true worship, which can be done only in the presence of God (ix. 8, 9). And on this account also the abolition of the law (vii. 19), which could perfect nothing, stands over against the introduction of a better hope (that, namely, to be looked for with the New Covenant, a priesthood making a real atonement, according to § 116, *a*), by which (*res sperata*) we draw near to God (*ἐγγίζομεν τῷ Θεῷ*).

[7] To draw near to God is brought forward even in the Epistle to the Ephesians as a prerogative of the redeemed (§ 104, *d*), and also the *λατρία* as the sacrifice of Christians (§ 105, *d*), even in the earlier Pauline Epistles (§ 73, *c*). Yet more peculiar does this drawing near to God, connected with sacrifice, appear in Peter (§ 45, *c*) as the prerogative of the priestly people. It seems so natural even here to think of the priests, to whom the drawing near to God and the *λατρεύειν* and the sacrifice alone pertained, at the same time also the *ἁγιασμός*, in the sense of note *b*, and the sprinkling with blood (x. 22), were specially appropriate for the priests (Ex. xxix. 21 ; Lev. viii. 30); yet the view of Christ as the alone High Priest, who must mediate the coming to God and the sacrifice of Christians (see above), so completely dominated the mode of presentation in our Epistle, that the idea of the general priesthood, which, however (p. 313), Messner (p. 313) ascribes to it, could only come in alongside of it (comp. moreover, § 124, *b*, footnote 6).

[8] If this veil (x. 20) is designated as the *σάρξ* of Christ, it is thereby indicated that the flesh of Christ must be first given up in death before the veil be taken

sacrifice effectual by His blood, and thus to become the πρόδρομος, who has not only opened the way thither, but has first trod it (vi. 20), and has thereby consecrated it for us (x. 20). Christians may now be encouraged in confidence on this High Priest (iv. 14, x. 21) to approach with boldness the throne of grace (iv. 16), which is in the Holiest (x. 22; comp. with ver. 19). The author can even designate Christians as those who have already come to the heavenly city of God (xii. 22), where the Judge as their covenant God dwells (ver. 23), with the Mediator of the New Covenant, whose blood testifies to the perfected atonement (ver. 24). This leads us on to the new relation to God, which has been set up on the ground of the perfect sacrifice of the New Covenant.

CHAPTER IV.

THE BLESSINGS AND DUTIES OF THE NEW COVENANT.

§ 124. *The New Testament Covenant People.*

In the New Covenant, Israel is, according to the promise, the true people of God, to the members of which and to their children God bestows again His paternal mercy and grace (*a*). But they became partakers of the New Covenant by baptism, in which they have received the blessings of the New Covenant, the forgiveness of sins and the outpouring of the Spirit (*b*). In that the law is written on their hearts, they have come to be of a new mind, and are drawn and led on by God to holiness and righteousness (*c*). To the blessings already given them belongs also enlightenment by the word of God of the New Covenant, an enlightenment which is to be ever advancing and ever becoming more perfect (*d*).

(*a*) If by the sacrifice of Christ the people of the Old Covenant are put into the position well-pleasing to God, then

away and the way into the Holiest be opened, that His sacrificial death, therefore, was the preparatory condition for that. If Immer (p. 412), following Holstein, gives this reference to the expression, that the flesh of Christ hid His Godhead as the veil hid the Holiest, all meaning is taken from it in the connection.

only now can that be realized, which was intended from the first in the covenant relation, but could be perfectly realized only in the New Covenant, in conformity with the promise (Jer. xxxi. 33). He has become their God, and they His people (viii. 10).[1] That is a point even with Paul (§ 83, *a*), that this people is beloved of God; and this appears here in the form, that to them the divine favour, the gracious good pleasure of God, is bestowed. The people of the New Covenant may come to the throne of God, as to the throne of grace (iv. 16: τῷ θρόνῳ τῆς χάριτος), with assured confidence (μετὰ παῤῥησίας), there to receive mercy and to find grace.[2] Grace appears here, then, not as the source of salvation, but as the advantage of the New Testament institution of salvation, which the good pleasure and the grace of God have bestowed again on the covenant people, beginning therewith the realization of the Messianic salvation.[3] This is here

[1] Peter, too, regards believing Israel as the real people of possession, or the flock of God (§ 45, *a*), a figure even here hinted at, when God gives to them a great shepherd (xiii. 20). The Israel of the New Covenant alone are the true family of God (iii. 6: οἶκος θεοῦ; comp. § 117, *a*, *b*); for those only can really belong to God who, having been perfected by purification and consecration, may draw near to God (§ 123). As God was not formerly ashamed to be called the God of the patriarchs (xi. 16), so He now calls Himself their God (comp. xii. 23, where πάντων, agreeably to the context, can refer only to all the members of the heavenly and the earthly community of God).

[2] In the LXX. ἵλεως corresponds to the Hebrew חֶסֶד, and χάριν εὑρίσκειν to מָצָא חֵן. Every one who falls away from Christ turns away from this grace of God (xii. 15: ὑστερῶν ἀπὸ τῆς χάριτος τοῦ θεοῦ); it is that grace which establishes the heart (xiii. 9), which gives the Spirit (x. 29: τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς χάριτος), and which is asked to be with them all in the concluding words, just as in the Pastoral Epistles (§ 108, *b*, footnote 4). It nowhere appears defined as to its nature by the contrasts, by which the Pauline idea gets its peculiar colouring (§ 75, *b*); and if it is not to be understood, as with Peter (§ 45, *b*, footnote 3), directly as a gift of the divine mercy, yet iv. 16 shows that the idea in our Epistle betrays quite its Old Testament origin, just as with him.

[3] Only in the passage ii. 9, according to the current reading, would grace be the principle of salvation, in virtue of which the institution of salvation took place, just as with Paul (§ 75, *c*). However, even as regards this passage, it is very striking that in it, not in any way the self-surrender of Christ to death, but His personal experience of it (the γεύσασθαι θανάτου), is designated as the effect of the grace of God. One very naturally remembers in these circumstances that while no doubt our MS. traditions clearly decide for the reading χάριτι θεοῦ, on the other hand the ancient, and partly the very ancient, patristic tradition are equally for χωρὶς θεοῦ, and that the way in which this latter reading has been accounted for is very artificial, while also the helplessness of the patristic exegetes, in the face of it, and the use made of it by the Nestorians, easily

also expressed quite in the manner of the Old Testament throughout, that the members of the people of God, or of the family of God, are called children of God (ii. 10).[4] In that way is indicated the certainty of the fatherly love, which must belong to the true children, in contradistinction to bastards (xii. 6–8). But, as with Paul, a share in the δόξα is expressly laid claim to as the child's right, on the ground of inheritance (§ 97, *c*), and so our author makes this combination.[5] As the Son of God has already plainly attained to the inheritance of a share in the Father's Lordship (i. 2; comp. § 118, *a*, footnote 2), so also must the children of God, though in a

enough explain how the apparently so simple Pauline χάριτι θεοῦ was substituted. But if χωρὶς θεοῦ stood originally, then this can be but an allusion to His being forsaken by God, on account of which, according to the oldest tradition (Mark xv. 34), the cry of Christ was uttered as He was tasting death.

[4] If, therefore, in our Epistle also the readers are addressed as brethren (iii. 1, 12, x. 19, xiii. 22; comp. ver. 23), it is quite clear from vi. 10, where brotherly love is characterized as a love shown towards the name of God, that they are brethren, because they all bear the name of sons of God. This brotherly love is shown by hospitality (xiii. 1, 2), in every sort of service (vi. 10), especially towards suffering brethren (xiii. 3; comp. x. 33, 34), as also in unanimity (xii. 14). The beautiful deeds of love (x. 24; comp. § 108, *d*, footnote 10) and beneficence, by which Christian fellowship was shown (comp. also x. 33, and for the idea of κοινωνία, § 41, *b*), are the true sacrifices, with which God is well pleased (xiii. 16), because they glorify His fatherly name.

[5] Moreover, here also, just as with Peter (§ 45, *d*), when exhorted not to give way to care, they are referred to the help of Divine Providence formerly assured to them in the Old Testament (xiii. 5, 6), and *not*, as in the words of Jesus (§ 20, *b*), to the fatherly love of God; the obligation of reverential submission under the fatherly chastisement (note *c*) results rather from the relation of sonship (xii. 9), as then the duty of childlike obedience. And in this combination also the relation of sonship is not grounded, as with Paul, on justification, but it rather presupposes τελείωσις, which is identical with the Pauline δικαίωσις (§ 123, *c*). On the other hand, there is no mention of a begetting of God's children on the part of God, not even ii. 11, as Riehm (p. 737) yet supposes (comp. § 118, *b*, footnote 5). If, xii. 9, God is designated as ὁ πατὴρ τῶν πνευμάτων, in opposition to the πατέρες τῆς σαρκὸς ἡμῶν, He cannot possibly be so designated as the author of the new life, but only as the Creator (comp. Jas. i. 17) of all spiritual beings, to which class angels (i. 14) as well as men belong (xii. 23), only that the latter, besides the πνεῦμα, have also the σάρξ (comp. § 27, *a*), begotten by their natural parents, according to which they have come from the loins of their fathers (vii. 5, 10). But to draw in here the contrasts of Traducianism and Creationism, and to seek to reconcile these contrasts, as Riehm, p. 680, does, imposes upon our author thoughts quite foreign to him. To regard God as the Father of spirits, and which, moreover, is explained, without any recourse to Philo, by such passages as Eccles. xii. 7, Num. xxvii. 16 (comp. Riehm, pp. 856, 857), excludes entirely the idea of a begetting the children of God.

different sense from that of Paul (comp. § 118, *c*, footnote 7), be conducted forward to the fatherly glory (ii. 10). Only it is characteristic that Paul, writing mostly to Gentiles, has in his eye the Roman right of inheritance, which knows no distinction between older and younger children, while here, in conformity with the Jewish law of inheritance, the sons, only in so far as they take the position of first-born sons, lay claim to the full possessions of the father (xii. 16 : *τὰ πρωτοτόκια*). As Christ, indeed, according to § 118, *b*, appears among the heavenly sons of God as the first-born, so the Christian Church is called *ἐκκλησία πρωτοτόκων* (xii. 23), and the words added, *ἀπογεγραμμένων ἐν οὐρανοῖς*, show unequivocally, that to those who are already enrolled as citizens in the heavenly city of God (comp. Luke x. 20, and, therewith, § 30, *d*), though they yet wander on the earth, the final consummation is therewith secured in virtue of this right of the first-born. As believing Israel are called to this (§ 117, *b*), so here, too, as with Peter (§ 45, *d*), the calling is essentially a calling to sonship, which brings with it the promise of the eternal *κληρονομία* (ix. 15).

(*b*) Among the subjects of elementary instruction is reckoned, vi. 2, instruction as to washings, *i.e.* as to the distinction between the observance of baptism and Jewish washings (ix. 10). The latter, namely, is a washing of the body with pure water (x. 23),[6] which symbolically assures of the cleansing of the conscience from the consciousness of guilt (ver. 22), inasmuch as there is connected with it, quite as in the early apostolic Church (§ 41, *a*), the confession

[6] The union of blood-sprinkling with washing in this passage seems to point to the consecration of the priests (comp. Lev. viii. 6, 30), especially if the two are regarded as the condition of drawing near to God (comp. Riehm, pp. 744, 745). But we have indeed seen, § 123, *d*, footnote 7, why the idea of a general priesthood cannot occur in our Epistle, and, in fact, the uniting of the two participial clauses, *ῥεραντισμένοι . . . καὶ λελουμένοι*, is throughout untenable. The second belongs rather to *κατίχωμεν*, and only takes up again the former; while in place of the sprinkling with blood, it puts the figurative assurance of its efficacy in the washing of baptism. Gess, p. 473 f., connects both with *κατίχωμεν*, and quite perversely refers the washing with pure water to moral renewal by the Spirit, appealing to Ezek. xxxvi. 25, 27. We have here rather the same view of baptism as in Peter (§ 44, *b*), while this occurs even in Paul, but quite in subordination to the view of baptism as a symbol peculiar to him (§ 84, *a*; 101, *a*).

(ὁμολογία) as the object of which Jesus is named in His specific Messianic character (iii. 1, iv. 14), or the fulfilment of the promise hoped for by Him (x. 23). In baptism, therefore, just as in the early apostolic Church, the confessor of the Messiah is made a partaker of a blessing essentially peculiar to the New Covenant—the forgiveness of sins (viii. 12, x. 17, after Jer. xxxi. 34).[7] If now, according to vi. 2, along with teaching about baptism there is added teaching about the laying on of hands, what is thereby thought of is the practice common in the early apostolic Church (§ 41, *d*), which, as the symbol of prayer for him who was being baptized, imparted to him the Spirit. Those who, according to vi. 4, have tasted of the heavenly gift, have been, at the same time, really made partakers of the Holy Ghost; and so it is presupposed, x. 29, that those who have been sanctified on the ground of the blood of the covenant, have, at the same time, received the Spirit of grace. And so here also, as in the apostolic preaching, along with the forgiveness of sins the gift of the Spirit is connected with baptism, and the Spirit appears, just as there (§ 40, *a*, footnote 1), *exclusively* as the principle of the gifts of grace, in so far as the signs and wonders and manifold mighty works, with which God confirmed the preaching of the ear-witnesses, are traced back to gifts of the Holy Spirit, which God distributed according to His will (ii. 4); and, according to vi. 5, all the members of the New Covenant have, to a certain extent, tasted of the powers of the Messianic age (§ 117, *c*).[8]

(*c*) If, according to vi. 1, fundamental Christian instruction began with *μετάνοια*, as formerly the preaching of Christ

[7] This is indeed pre-eminently the heavenly gift which the Christian, according to vi. 4, has tasted; for, according to iii. 14, they are made partakers of Christ Himself, *i.e.* of the salvation presented in His atoning sacrifice, they have eaten of the New Testament altar of sacrifice (xiii. 10), *i.e.* they have been made partakers of the fruit of the sacrifice offered on the cross.

[8] It is self-evident that in these passages the Spirit is not regarded as a person, but as a divine power given to us, just as with Paul (§ 84, *a*, footnote 4). On the other hand, it was easy to refer *the blessing* of the New Covenant, by which the law was written on the heart (viii. 10, x. 16), back to this gift of the Spirit; yet this combination is not made by our author, and thus on that account the Pauline contrast of the covenant of the Spirit to the covenant of the law is foreign to him (comp. § 115, *b*, footnote 3).

(§ 21) and the early apostolic preaching did (§ 40, *b*), then there must have taken place in the members of the New Testament Church a change of mind, which implied a turning away from dead, *i.e.* sinful works (§ 115, *b*, footnote 6), and which must therefore lead to a mind well-pleasing to God. But this is given of itself, when, conformably with the promise of the New Covenant (Jer. xxxi. 33), the law is written on the heart (viii. 10, x. 16), according to which this has to be regarded as the abiding tendency of the heart for the fulfilling of the divine will.[9] Now, he who has been consecrated to God by the blood of Christ, aims steadily after holiness (xii. 14; comp. § 123, *b*), while he preserves himself from every stain from new sin, and, in particular, from the heathenish sins (§ 69, *d*) of unchastity both in and out of marriage, and of covetousness (xiii. 4, 5). In this God Himself helps him, while He establishes his heart by His grace (ver. 9), and accompanies him in every way (ver. 25); but, in particular, while by His fatherly chastisement in times of trial He draws His true children to an ever fuller participation in His holiness (xii. 5–10), and so works in them the peace-bringing fruits of righteousness, *i.e.* the kind of life well-pleasing to God (ver. 11),[10] which makes every sorrow to be to Him an object of joy (comp. § 46, *d*; 55, *c*). So God Himself here also makes the Christians ready for every good work, to do His will, while He works in them what is well-pleasing to Him through Christ (xiii. 21), whom He has even on that account, on the ground of the blood of the New Testament covenant, made to be the chief Shepherd of His own people (ver. 20; comp. § 121, *d*), so that He now by His royal and priestly activity may help them in their trials

[9] On this account everything depends here also on the tendency of the heart, just as § 26, *c*, and in the early apostolic teaching (§ 47, *a*; 55, *b*), because God searches the deepest depths of the heart (iv. 12, 13). Only with a true, *i.e.* an upright heart, can one draw near to God (x. 22). The deadly sin of unbelief, or of falling away, can come only from an evil heart (iii. 12; comp. § 125, *d*, footnote 9).

[10] The peace of the soul must there make its appearance, where the state of being well-pleasing to God, *i.e.* of righteousness, has been established in the man, when he has a good conscience, ἐν πᾶσιν καλοῖς θέλειν ἀναστρέφεσθαι (xiii. 18). And hence also God, who works all that pertains to this in men (ver. 21), is called the God of Peace (ver. 20), and Melchisedec, the King of Righteousness, is at the same time called the King of Peace (vii. 2).

(ii. 18), and give them at the proper time help from the throne of grace (iv. 16).[11]

(*d*) Among the blessings of the New Covenant, this also is mentioned in the prophecy (Jer. xxxi. 34), that the knowledge of God shall be alike and common to all (viii. 11). The author is naturally thereby thinking of the perfect revelation of God made in the words of God by the Son (i. 1), and which ought to have already fitted even the readers in an ordinary way to be able to be teachers (v. 12). For they also have tasted the good word of God, which guarantees the fulfilment of the promise in the New Covenant (vi. 5); they have obtained the knowledge of the truth (x. 26: *ἐπίγνωσις τῆς ἀληθείας*), and are therefore enlightened (vi. 4, x. 32: *φωτισθέντες*; comp. § 107, *a*). But there are different stages in the revelation of the New Testament word of God, as there are in the knowledge wrought by it. The introductory parts, the elements of the word of God, or of the proclamation of Christ (v. 12: *τὰ στοιχεῖα τῆς ἀρχῆς τῶν λογίων τοῦ Θεοῦ*; comp. vi. 1: *ὁ τῆς ἀρχῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ λόγος*), are designated by the author, as by Paul (§ 102, *b*), figuratively as milk (v. 12), as it is suitable for *νήπιοι* (ver. 13), in contrast to the strong meat, which the *τέλειοι* can bear (ver. 14; comp. *τελειότης*, vi. 1). This fundamental teaching consists, according to vi. 1, 2, in the preaching of repentance and faith, with which evangelical preaching began (Mark i. 15; comp. Acts xvii. 30, 31, and with that § 61, *a*; 19, 4), in instruction about baptism and the laying on of hands (note *b*), and about eschatological events. By the strong meat, on the other

[11] In what way God carries on this His work of grace through Christ our Epistle gives no hint, only it is certain that the Pauline doctrine so richly developed of the living fellowship with Christ and the work of His Spirit in the Christian (§ 84, 86) remains foreign to it. But He naturally does it in this way, that He equips His servants to speak such words of exhortation as this Epistle contains; and finally, all are required in the most pressing terms to keep each other from falling away (iii. 12, 13), and to advance in good works (x. 24). In this sense it is in particular the duty of those who are over them to watch for their souls (xiii. 17), and the church assemblies is the place where such exhortations are addressed (x. 25), and they are therefore to listen to the one and not to forsake the other. Along with this, good example is particularly to be attended to, as exercising a wholesome influence (xii. 12, 13), as evil example has a tempting influence (ver. 15), and therefore the author does not weary to present the example of the heroes of the faith, who look down on Christians in their fight (xii. 1), their departed leaders (xiii. 7), and even Christ Himself (xii. 2, 3).

hand, by which the author seeks (vi. 1), with God's help (vi. 3), to lead on those readers, who at any rate have not kept behind at the stage of νηπιότης, and have become dull of mind (v. 11–13), on the supposition of the zeal for τελειότης quickened in them afresh by his exhortations, he evidently means those deeper instructions as to the relation of the New Covenant to the Old, which our Epistle furnishes.[12]

§ 125. *The Duty of the New Testament Covenant.*

The duty of the New Testament covenant is the inflexible holding fast the hope of the fulfilment of the covenant promise guaranteed in the New Covenant, and this is not possible without faith (*a*). This faith, which is the distinguishing mark of all the pious of the Old Covenant, is in the New Covenant a firm confidence in the fulfilment of the covenant promise, and a confident persuasion of the saving facts, by which that fulfilment is guaranteed according to the gospel proclamation (*b*). In this faith consists essentially that state of mind well-pleasing to God, on the firm keeping hold of which in enduring patience depends participation in the perfected salvation (*c*). But sin is simply unbelief, and falling away from faith is the sin which never can be forgiven, because it gives evidence of final hardening (*d*).

(*a*) If the members of the New Testament covenant are so highly privileged, that they are fit to obtain directly the Old Testament promise (§ 123, *c*, footnote 5), then the hope of the fulfilment of this promise is their distinguishing mark. They are designated as those who have fled to seize firmly the hope presented for their immediate grasp (vi. 18) in the promise confirmed by an oath (ver. 17).[1] Thus this strong

[12] That there is no reference here to the contrast between πίστις and γνῶσις, as Köstlin (compare 1854, pp. 403, 404), Riehm, pp. 783–785, has abundantly proved. All these deeper instructions have but the practical tendency to strengthen the hope that what was left unrealized in the Old will be perfected in the New Covenant. But that leads on to the explanation of the duty of the New Testament covenant, on the fulfilment of which participation in this perfection depends.

[1] If this hope is compared to an anchor, which is firm and reliable, because it reaches into the heavenly Holiest (ver. 19), whither Christ as our πρόδρομος has gone (ver. 20), it is implied in this that this hope rests on the heavenly high-priesthood of Christ. For this is indeed the new priesthood promised for the

emphasizing of the hope was, no doubt, occasioned by the fact that the hope of the readers was getting weaker (§ 111, *a*); it reminds us thus so very much of the central position of hope with Peter (§ 51), and is so closely connected with the whole fundamental view of the author, that it ought not to be reckoned among the peculiarities of his method of teaching, to see in the Messianic hope, *i.e.* in the hope of the fulfilment of the Old Covenant relationship guaranteed by the appearance of the Messiah, the characteristic privilege of Christians. Therefore also the uninterrupted holding fast of the glad confidence (*παῤῥησία*; comp. x. 35), and of the high pre-eminence in it (*καύχημα*), which such a hope gives, is the condition of belonging to God's New Testament family (iii. 6; comp. § 117, *b*); and thus the unwavering holding fast (comp. x. 23) of an assured hope (comp. vi. 11: *ἡ πληροφορία τῆς ἐλπίδος*) is the New Testament covenant duty.[2] Only to those who look for the return of Messiah with such a hope can He appear as the Saviour (ix. 28). A firm confidence (*ὑπόστασις*), however, is required for the fulfilment of this duty, and hence the uninterrupted holding fast of that confidence, and also of the glad hope itself (iii. 6), can be reckoned (ver. 14) the condition of participation in Christ, *i.e.* in the blessings of the New Covenant procured by Him (§ 124, *b*). Such a confidence is now the *πίστις ἐπὶ Θεόν*, which is designated (vi. 1) the fundamental article of evan-

Messianic time, with which the perfect atonement, and therefore the full realization of the object of the covenant, was brought into view (*vii.* 19). According to x. 23, also, Christians confess the final consummation hoped for, which by the addition *πιστὸς γὰρ ὁ ἐπαγγειλάμενος* marked out as the fulfilment of the promise, and which, in conformity with the connection with vv. 19–21, is based on the exaltation of the Messianic High Priest.

[2] The hope itself must not be regarded as this covenant duty, as neither must it be regarded, with Riehm, p. 751, as the condition for drawing near to God. For, vii. 19, it is not the subjective hope, as iii. 6, vi. 11, but, according to a well-known metonymy, as vi. 18, x. 23, the *res sperata* that is meant, the perfect priesthood, namely, and the perfect atonement given with it as the object of the hope directed to the setting up of the New Covenant (comp. § 116, *a*). Just so is Christ, vi. 20, our *πρόδρομος*, and therefore by Him, and not by our hope, is the way to God prepared, although that hope is yet in that objective sense (as the fulfilment of the promise hoped for: *ἡ προκειμένη ἐλπίς*) compared to an anchor, because as the latter rests immoveably on the bottom of the ocean, so hope has its guarantee, which cannot be shaken, in the heavenly Holiest, when the work of redemption is completed (comp. footnote 1).

gelical preaching; for such preaching begins with the announcement that God, by sending Messiah, has guaranteed the fulfilment of His promise. But faith is expressly explained, xi. 1, as a firm confidence of things hoped for (ἐλπιζομένων ὑπόστασις), and, at the same time, as a persuasion of unseen things (πραγμάτων ἔλεγχος οὐ βλεπομένων), which makes the things as sure as though they were seen (ver. 27).[3]

(*b*) Faith, as it is described, xi. 1, has been the mark of all the holy from the beginning (ver. 2). According to the various promises which these receive, the ἐλπιζόμενα and the οὐ βλεπόμενα were ever very various, but the nature of faith was not thereby altered.[4] With the members of the New Covenant, the sum of the ἐλπιζόμενα, in reference to which

[3] There is here therefore also implied in the idea of πίστις both a confident trust on the faithfulness (xi. 11; comp. x. 23) and the power (ver. 19) of God, who both will and can fulfil His promise; and, on the other hand, a confident persuasion of things not perceptible to the senses, as, *e.g.*, the creation of the world, in which the visible was expressly called into existence by the invisible creative word of God, and not made of things perceptible to the senses, that it might remain an object of faith (ver. 3). As the former trust is connected with the παῤῥησία of hope, so the latter thorough persuasion has to do with its πληροφορία. The close connection of faith with hope gives its peculiar colour to the idea of faith in our Epistle, and puts it very near to the Petrine idea (§ 44, *a*, footnote 2). Neither does πίστις include hope (comp. Usteri, p. 256), nor does the latter take its place (comp. Baur, p. 252); but neither is it a manifestation and evidence of faith, nor its flower and crown (comp. Riehm, pp. 709, 752); for faith even presupposes hope if it is a waiting for the ἐλπιζόμενα (xi. 1). Faith is rather the only condition under which the fast holding of hope, and therewith the fulfilment of the covenant duty, is possible.

[4] With Abel and Enoch, faith was the conviction of God's existence, and of His retribution (ver. 6) in general. Noah already possessed a divine word of promise (ver. 7: χρηματισθείς), so that with him the conviction of its truth coincided with trust in its fulfilment. Sarah and Abraham relied on the promise of the posterity assured to them in the son of promise (ver. 11, xii. 17–19); Isaac and Jacob, on the fulfilment of the blessing given them by word of mouth (vv. 20, 21); all the patriarchs, on the possession of the promised land (vv. 8, 9, 22). But as Abraham, according to § 115, *a*, already possessed the same promise, whose fulfilment should have been brought about by the Old Covenant, but was actually brought about by the New, the faith of all the patriarchs already kept the fulfilment of this highest promise in view (vv. 13–16; comp. ver. 10), with which the conviction of the reality of the unseen heavenly fatherland was given (vv. 13, 15), and so all the other heroes of faith (ver. 39), when their faith could rest on promises in detail, for the fulfilment of which they survived (ver. 33), as the examples in vv. 28–31 show. Even in the case of Christ Himself, the joy of His heavenly exaltation set before Him as reward, was the object of that faith of His which is our example (xii. 2; comp. § 120, *d*).

they had a sure confidence, is nothing else than the contents of the covenant promise, whose fulfilment had been guaranteed to them by the setting up of the New Covenant: the *οὐ βλεπόμενα*, on the other hand, are the institutions and blessings of salvation presented in this covenant, in reference to which they were thoroughly persuaded by the gospel proclamation. If the former was given with the relation in which faith stands to hope (note *a*), it is then confirmed by iv. 2, according to which the word of the promise, which was the same in the Old Covenant as it is in the New, did not profit the hearers, if it was not united to them, if it was not appropriated by them by faith, *i.e.* by trust on the promise given in it. But that the *οὐ βλεπόμενα* are not the realities of the invisible (heavenly) world (Pfleiderer, p. 352 [E. T. ii. 80]), is clear from x. 22, according to which the *πληροφορία πίστεως* can exist only when we have acknowledged Jesus as the perfect High Priest (ver. 21), and His blood as the means by which the way to God is opened up (vv. 19, 20).[5] Since, now, this is even the contents of the New Testament proclamation, everything depends on the firm conviction of the truth of this proclamation, and such conviction is demanded, if the regard to the New Testament proclamation, required ii. 1, is accounted for by the greatest confidence in it possible (vv. 3, 4), and the turning away from it is characterized as a sin against Him who speaks from heaven (xii. 25; comp. § 116, *b*, footnote 3).

(*c*) This faith, as it has become the mark of all the holy, is the mind which is specifically well-pleasing to God, and therefore the principal element in *δικαιοσύνη*. Without faith it is impossible to please God (xi. 6; comp. x. 38); by faith

[5] And thus it is plain why Christ is not spoken of directly as the object of faith; but this is neither because He here furnishes the pattern of faith (Biedermann, p. 249), nor is it because He has won for faith its full contents (in the sense of Pfleiderer, p. 352 [E. T. ii. 83]). As He who is and abides unchangeably what He has become for Christians by His exaltation to be the Messianic High Priest, then, according to the connection of xiii. 8, it is He on whom the demand of an abiding trust in the fulfilment of the promise (ver. 7) is made to rest. But just because this is ever the main side of *πίστις* in the Epistle to the Hebrews, while the other, the being thoroughly persuaded, is but the presupposition for it, the Pauline formula cannot here be impressed. But that faith is here the persistent striving after eternal blessings (Schenkel, p. 127 f.), is decidedly incorrect.

all the holy ones of the Old Covenant have had a good witness borne them in God's word of the Old Testament, *i.e.* by God Himself (xi. 39; comp. ver. 2); nay, through faith Abel had a good witness borne him, that he was well-pleasing (δίκαιος) to God (xi. 4); and Noah, who is the first expressly said to be δίκαιος in the Old Testament (Gen. vi. 9), has gotten this righteousness κατὰ πίστιν (xi. 7).[6] Only believers, therefore, can enter into God's rest (iv. 3), and inherit eternal life (x. 38, 39), as even the law showed in the case of the pious of the Old Covenant (vi. 15), that the inheritance of the promise could be obtained only by faith (ver. 12).[7] Along with πίστις in this passage, μακροθυμία is mentioned (comp. ver. 15), which, as in Jas. v. 10, Col. i. 11, designates that endurance, by which faith is verified in the apparent delay in the fulfilment of the promise. If sufferings, moreover, are added, which seem to stand in sharpest contradiction to the fulfilment of the promise, then there is need of patience (ὑπομονή: xii. 1, 7; comp. § 30, *a*; 46, *d*; 55, *c*), which, just like faith, is therefore the condition for the fulfilment of the promise (x. 36), because it is needed to preserve the joyfulness of hope (ver. 35). According to ver. 36, this

[6] It requires no proof to show that the righteousness imputed to faith by grace in the Pauline sense is not meant here, as this idea is not only awanting in our Epistle, but is excluded by the analogies, and by other presuppositions, from the complete idea of τελείωσις (comp. § 123, *c*). It is not, moreover, involved in the passage that δικαιοσύνη was wrought in Noah by God, inasmuch as, according to the explicit statement, he earned it by his own conduct. And therefore the Gospel may be called a λόγος δικαιοσύνης (v. 13), inasmuch as by its proclamation this mind well-pleasing to God is quickened. How far the author is from the Pauline idea of justification by faith, x. 38 shows very clearly, where the passage Hab. ii. 4, quoted in favour of it by Paul (Gal. iii. 11; Rom. i. 17), is so used by him, differing in this from Paul, but agreeing with the original sense of the passage, that ἐκ πίστεως is separated from ὁ δίκαιος, and thus the essence of δικαιοσύνη is placed in πίστις. Comp. the excellent exposition of Pfleiderer, p. 356 f. [E. T. ii. 85].

[7] Here is shown quite the difference between this conception of the idea of faith and the Pauline, as the latter receives its specific expression in the doctrine of justification. For there faith is plainly confidence in the salvation *already given* in Christ, and is therefore the condition of justification realized presently. But in this form it is something specifically peculiar to Christianity, as the justifying faith of Abraham, as to its nature, but not as to its object, as is partly the case in our Epistle (comp. note *b*, footnote 4), was identical with it. And the dispensation of the law forms altogether the contrast to the dispensation of faith of Christianity (comp. § 82).

patience is the will of God, *i.e.* what He specifically requires in the New Covenant.[8]

(*d*) The more that the essence of righteousness for our author consists in faith, the more is there but one sin pre-eminently designated as sin simply, and that is a falling away from faith (xii. 4, iii. 13). Even the first generation of the covenant people did not obtain the promise on account of their sin (iii. 16, 17), and this sin was their disobedience to the divine requirement of faith (ver. 18; comp. iv. 6, xi. 31), *i.e.* their unbelief (iii. 19).[9] Thus the cowardly shrinking from faith is now (x. 38, 39: ὑποστολή) a despising of God speaking from heaven (xii. 25); it is even a falling away from the living God (iii. 12), and even a sin of fornication in the sense of the Old Testament (xii. 16, and along with it § 117, *b*), inasmuch as one prefers the promise of the world to His service and the service of His promise (comp. Jas. iv. 4, and therewith § 55, *a*). But the falling away of such as have gotten the knowledge of salvation in Christ (x. 26), and have experienced all His blessings (vi. 4–6),[10] is therewith characterized as a sin, which is yet more terrible than that of frivolous disobedience, for which, under the Old Covenant, death was assigned (x. 28); it is a daring sin, a wilful sinning against

[8] According to the connection of ver. 36 with vv. 38, 39, patience is nothing else at bottom than faith proved in suffering (vv. 32–34), a faith which does not timorously shrink back in the trial of affliction, and does not grow weak (xii. 3). The faith of the pious, mentioned xi. 35–38, consisted in fact in this patience, which endures even to death (xii. 4), and bears willingly the reproach of Christ (xiii. 13; comp. xi. 26), as Christ has Himself given us an example therein (xii. 2, 3).

[9] As with Peter (§ 44, *a*, *c*), and in one respect at least with Paul (§ 82, *d*), so here too, the want of faith, which is the condition for the perfecting of salvation (iv. 3), is qualified as disobedience (ver. 11); as, on the other hand, the faith which secures the final salvation is qualified as obedience towards Christ (v. 9). Hence only an evil heart can lead to such unbelief (iii. 12: καρδία πονηρὰ ἀπιστίας; comp. § 124, *c*, footnote 9), a heart which is hardened by the deceit of sin (ver. 13; comp. vv. 8, 15, iv. 7). If even one, growing indifferent to the salvation offered in the perfect revelation of God (ii. 3), falls short of the grace of God (xii. 15), and with a profane mind gives up (xii. 16) his birthright, as Esau (§ 124, *a*), for earthly blessings (*i.e.* in conformity with the circumstances of the readers, for deliverance from the persecutions which afflicted the Christians), he will so relax the zeal to obtain the covenant promise (iv. 11), and therewith the zeal to keep hold of the hope (vi. 11, 12), that by disobedience he ceases to fulfil the duty of faith, which alone leads to a holding fast the hope.

[10] By such a falling away Christ is crucified afresh, while the character of

better knowledge and conscience (ἑκουσίως ἁμαρτάνειν), for which there is no more any sacrifice, but only the avenging judgment over the enemies of God (vv. 26, 27). There is therefore even in the New Covenant, as in the Old (§ 115, *b*), a malignant sin for which its atoning institute is not available, and which can hence never be forgiven, like the sin against the Holy Ghost, of which Jesus speaks (§ 22, *b*), because he who commits it *can* no more be renewed to repentance (vi. 4–6), as even Esau found no more room for μετάνοια (xii. 17).[11]

§ 126. *The Fulfilment of the Covenant Promise.*

Although the perfect salvation is but a getting possession of the Old Covenant promise, yet may it, in so far as it is connected with the fulfilment of covenant duty, be also regarded as wages (*a*). The immediately impending judgment of God decides as to the bestowal of this salvation, the day of which judgment is ushered in with the overthrow of the world, and brings everlasting destruction to all the enemies of God (*b*). But to believers Christ appears as the deliverer from this destruction, and leads their souls to eternal life (*c*). Then begins the final consummation in the unchangeable kingdom of God, when the risen in the heavenly city of God see God in glory and in eternal Sabbath festival (*d*).

(*a*) While the patriarchs (xi. 13), and all believers of the Old Covenant (ver. 39), did not really receive the promise, as they had first to be perfected by the one sacrifice of Christ

His death as the sin-offering of the New Covenant, on which all Christian hope rests, is denied; and as with unbelievers it is declared to be the death of a transgressor (vi. 6), the Son of God is therefore trampled under foot, while the blood of the covenant is regarded as unclean, and the grace of the Spirit is despised, while it is declared to be a misleading, false spirit, which misleads the Church which believes on Messiah (x. 29).

[11] This impossibility is represented, to be sure, under the figure vi. 7, 8, as the result of a divine sentence of rejection; but iii. 13 shows that only the divine judgment of hardening is thereby meant (§ 29, *d*; 91, *c*), by which the hearts which are given over to sin, become in the end so hardened by the deceitfulness of sin, or so harden themselves (iii. 8, 15, iv. 7), that a return is no longer possible. But if the members of the Church generally could fall away, it follows that the reversion of the heavenly perfection, which became theirs in virtue of the right of the first-born (xii. 23; comp. § 124, *a*), is not irrevocable.

(ver. 40), the members of the New Covenant have this advantage over them, that they are fitted and destined to receive directly the perfect salvation promised.[1] But now, as the definite obtaining of the promise remains dependent on the fulfilment of New Testament covenant duty (x. 36; comp. § 125, *c*), so this too can be conceived of as wages for this fulfilment (ver. 35: *μισθαποδοσία*). To be sure, the reward is but the fulfilment of a promise given of His own free will, and the service is nothing else but holding fast the joyful confidence of this fulfilment (*παῤῥησία*): but after that God had once, in a new covenant, as at all times (xi. 6: *μισθαποδότης*), connected the fulfilment of His promise with the fulfilment of a definite duty (comp. x. 36: *τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ*), a relation of reward is ever again presented, which may now be available for the performance of this duty (comp. § 32). As Moses looked to the recompense of reward (xi. 26), as Christ Himself endured the cross in view of the reward set before Him (xii. 2), so can the Christian give up the earthly in view of the higher reward (x. 34).[2]

(*b*) If there is a reward of wages, there is also naturally a retributive punishment (ii. 2: *μισθαποδοσία*), and which of the two is to be given to each individual is decided by the last judgment, which the fundamental doctrine of Christianity

[1] As the possession of the Holy Land promised to Abraham (xi. 8), so here this perfect salvation is designated as their everlasting possession (ix. 15); but as, according to § 124, *a*, this salvation is regarded as the portion of the Christian as a child, here the idea of *κληρονομία*, which, moreover, elsewhere occurs, as in Peter (§ 50, *c*), for the inheritance promised to believers (vi. 12: *οἱ . . . κληρονομοῦντες τὰς ἐπαγγελίας*; comp. i. 14: *κληρονομεῖν τὴν σωτηρίαν*), passes over into that of heirship (comp. vi. 17). It agrees with this that the Son is appointed to be *κληρονόμος*, and as such has received a name higher than the angels (i. 2); so also xii. 17, according to which Esaü *wished* to inherit his father's blessing. As, moreover, from the point of view of hope, by which the Christian even now possesses what is allotted to him as a sure possession in the future (§ 117, *d*), Christians can even now be designated as *κληρονόμοι τῆς ἐπαγγελίας* (vi. 17), although the special *κληρονομεῖν* of the promise (= *λαμβάνειν*: ix. 15; *ἐπιτυγχάνειν*: vi. 15; xi. 33; *νομίζεσθαι*: x. 36) is inherited only through *πίστις* and *μακροθυμία* (vi. 12). Just so Isaac and Jacob are said to be fellow-possessors of the promise with Abraham, which they have not yet received (xi. 9; comp. 1 Pet. iii. 7, and therewith § 51, *c*).

[2] This is but the same doctrine of retribution which we found in the early apostolic system of doctrine (§ 51, *d*; 57, *b*), and even in Paul (§ 98, *c*). It does not even go beyond that, when, vi. 10, it is traced to the retributive righteousness of God, that He does not leave out of His regard those doings of a

announces as *κρῖμα αἰώνιον* (vi. 2). To this judgment God has reserved retributive punishment (x. 30), and His judgment is dreadful (ver. 31) and unavoidable (xii. 25). He brings upon those who have fallen away, and upon all the enemies of God (*ὑπεναντιοι*), the *ἀπώλεια* (x. 39), which, according to ix. 27, is not only bodily death, but in every case something more dreadful (x. 28, 29), and it is repeatedly represented as a consuming fire (ver. 27, xii. 29; comp. vi. 8). If by this figure of the Old Testament (Deut. iv. 24, ix. 3) fire can be taken as the current symbol of the divine wrath, then the repeated reference to its consuming energy can only be so understood, that that destruction is no longer considered simply, as § 34, *c*, 99, *b*, as an abiding of the soul in death, but as a sort of potential death, as a torturing form of destruction.[3] But this judgment does not follow immediately on the death of any one, as has been concluded from ix. 27 (comp. also Biedermann, p. 300; Pfleiderer, p. 362 [E. T. ii. 91]); but there is a day which, as the judgment-day of God known in the Old Testament (comp. § 40, *d*; 64, *b*), is spoken of as simply the day (x. 25), and it appears from the connection of xii. 26 with vv. 25, 29, that this day is introduced with the last great shaking of the heaven and the earth (ver. 26, after Hag. ii. 7), *i.e.* with the overthrow of the present world

man by which he fulfils his covenant duty; but to him who has hitherto approved himself (even though it may be but in one respect), He gives help for yet future confirmation (ver. 9), although the attainment of this goal ever remains dependent on his further conduct (vv. 11, 12). There is therefore here no ground afforded, with Ritschl, ii. p. 116, to conceive, on grounds of purely dogmatic considerations, God's righteousness to be determined by the logical results of His dealings in reference to the salvation, as even here it is not "the exercise of love on the part of the readers as an activity of divine grace which is taken account of," as Ritschl asserts without any proof.

[3] If death is the punishment of sin, according to § 122, *d*, inasmuch as it delivers men over to the power of the devil, then, according to ii. 14, this power ceases for the redeemed with the overthrow of all hostile powers generally, and the final *ἀπώλεια* can hence, for those who have committed deadly sins, be no longer merely abiding in death, but only something more terrible—and that is the gradual annihilation inflicted by it. If, in Old Testament fashion, God appears exclusively as the judge of the world (xii. 23, xiii. 4), who is therefore to be served with reverential awe and fear (xii. 28), the reason is this, that to the idea of an eternal high priest (§ 120), Christ's intervention in the last judgment was little suited (comp. Schenkel, p. 338). On the other hand, God exercises judicial functions even here by means of His word, which penetrates and divides the innermost parts of men (iv. 12, 13).

(comp. Ἡ. 11, 12), an idea which is hinted at even in the words of Jesus (§ 33, *c*).

(*c*) If Christ also is not regarded as the judge of the world, yet here too, as generally, the day of judgment is regarded as coincident with the day of His second coming, when God brings in again His First-begotten into the world (i. 6), and to this day shall the present generation survive.[4] But believers expect Him to appear, for the second time, not for judgment, but for salvation (ix. 28) from the destruction which overtakes all in whom, on account of their rebelliousness, His soul has no pleasure (x. 38, 39). As the everlasting High Priest, He can for ever deliver those who draw near to God by Him (vii. 25), so that they now reach the possession of the σωτηρία (i. 14: κληρονομεῖν σωτηρίαν; comp. footnote 1).[5] But this salvation, as in the early apostolic system of doctrine generally (§ 50, *d*; 57, *d*), is a salvation of the soul, which, as in the words of Jesus, is designated as a saving of it (x. 39: περιποίησις ψυχῆς), since when lost it goes into

[4] The second coming, that is to say, and the judgment are at hand (x. 37, after Hab. ii. 3); for the end simply, which comes with this day, the readers are to make ready (iii. 14, vi. 11), because then their salvation is at hand (ver. 9). It is precarious, from iii. 9, to conclude with Riehm, p. 618, that the author, according to the type of the forty years' wandering in the wilderness, had in view a period of forty years from the dawn of the Messianic time (§ 117, *c*) to the coming of the final consummation, a period which was, at any rate, presently approaching its end. Yet the author, along with his readers, sees the day already approaching (x. 25), apparently because the foretokens of the catastrophe in Judaea, with which Christ had prophesied of it as coincident (§ 33, *b*), were already visible. That the execution of the divine judgment must take place before the second coming (Schenkel, p. 339), is nowhere indicated.

[5] As by the perfecting of Christ as the High Priest everything is achieved that is necessary for the salvation of believers, it can be said, v. 9, that He has already become the author of eternal (final) salvation, or the ἀρχηγὸς τῆς σωτηρίας αὐτῶν, ii. 10 (comp. Acts iii. 15, and therewith § 40, *d*), *i.e.* the leader who, by His entrance into the heavenly glory (comp. vi. 20), shows to all the way which leads to their salvation. Regarded from the ideal standpoint of Christian hope (comp. § 117, *d*), the salvation as, according to footnote 1, the possession of the promise, already exists when the conditions of the future salvation are given (comp. § 96, *b*), therefore also salvation may be proclaimed through Christ already (ii. 3). On the other hand, it follows neither from i. 14 nor from ii. 3, that the idea of σωτηρία includes the positive element of perfect blessedness (Riehm, p. 793), as even the ἀρχηγὸς τῆς σωτηρίας does not certainly designate the original possessor of salvation. Neither in the early apostolic nor in the Pauline system of doctrine have we found any trace anywhere of this turn of the idea so clear in its origin.

everlasting destruction, which here forms the contrast to it (comp. § 26, *b*, footnote 1; 34, *c*);[6] and its correlate is hence life in the highest sense, which, even according to Old Testament doctrine (Hab. ii. 4), results from righteousness, essentially consisting of faith (§ 125, *c*), or from subjection to fatherly chastisement (xii. 9; comp. for these correlative ideas, § 50, *c*; 57, *d*; 96, *c*).

(*d*) The final consummation begins in the immovable kingdom (xii. 28), *i.e.* in the perfect kingdom of God (comp. § 34, *a*; 57, *d*), which Christians are to receive in idea, but whose coming yet presupposes (comp. § 117, *d*) the change (i. 11, 12) that comes with the last shaking of the heaven and the earth (vv. 26, 27). This kingdom appears under the image of the city founded by God Himself (xi. 10), for which even the patriarchs longed as for their heavenly home (vv. 14 to 16), and so they felt themselves to be but strangers and pilgrims on the earth (ver. 13; comp. vv. 9, 10). But even Christians, although they are come even now in a certain sense to this heavenly Jerusalem (xii. 22), yet long after the abiding city of the future (xiii. 14), as their better possession (x. 34); and they must therefore feel themselves, as with Peter (§ 51, *a*, footnote 1), upon this earth as strangers and pilgrims. In this heavenly city of God they will live in immediate nearness to God, seeing His face (xii. 14; comp. § 34, *b*; 99, *b*), and, delivered from destruction, they shall share (ii. 10: εἰς δόξαν ἀγαγόντα, τὸν ἀρχηγὸν τῆς σωτηρίας) in His glory (comp. § 118, *c*, footnote 7). The final consummation, according to this, is not an earthly one (comp. Riehm, p. 797). The contrast also between heaven and earth appears here, at any rate, to be removed by the change coming on the world, as § 34, *a*; 99 *b*. Hence the resurrection is yet required for sharing in it; the Christian fundamental tradition already announced this resurrection (vi. 2), which is a better resurrection than the simple re-

[6] Even on this account is hope in the objective sense, *i.e.* the hoped-for fulfilment of the covenant promise (vi. 19; comp. § 125, *a*, footnote 2), designated as the anchor of the soul, inasmuch as it guarantees the soul its endless deliverance, and assures it from perishing. Even in the psychological basis of its view of doctrine, that is to say, our Epistle shows decisively the early apostolic type of doctrine in contradistinction from the Pauline; and Riehm, p. 671, from iv. 12, wrongly concludes that man is conceived of trichotomically (comp. § 27, *c*).

awakening to the earthly life (xi. 35), which individual pious ones had experienced.[7] Thus believers enter finally into the rest of God; for as He rested on the seventh day (Gen. ii. 2), so they also rest from all their works (iv. 3, 4; comp. ver. 10). The rest which Israel found in the beloved land was but an imperfect copy of it (ver. 8), as they could not enter (iii. 18, 19) on the perfect rest on account of their unbelief (iv. 6). Therewith the eternal Sabbath festival of the people of God begins (ver. 9).

SECTION II.

THE SECOND EPISTLE OF PETER AND THE EPISTLE OF JUDE.

CHAPTER V.

CHRISTIAN HOPE AND CHRISTIAN STRIVING AFTER VIRTUE.

§ 127. *The Object of Christian Knowledge.*

The object of the knowledge which constitutes the essence of Christianity is, in the first place, the grace of God, who hath called us in the new relation of children to obtain the

[7] That this resurrection is a general one (Riehm, p. 794), is shut out by this, that it is designated here as the goal of the hope of believers (comp. § 99, *b*). With this corresponds the idea of the eternal ἀπώλεια, explained note *b*, which leads to the torturing annihilation of the enemies of God; and vi. 2, where the ἀνάστασις and the κρῖμα αἰώνιον form the two sides of the eschatological prospect. How the author conceived of the entrance of survivors into the glory of the heavenly city of God is not clear. The change on the form of the world appears also to change their bodies (comp. § 34, *b*). But if lately it has been in various ways concluded from xii. 23 that the author makes believers enter immediately after death on the final consummation (Biedermann, p. 300 f.; Pfleiderer, p. 361 [E. T. ii. 91]; Schenkel, p. 340), that rests on a mistaken conception of τελειοῦσθαι (comp. § 123, *c*, footnote 5), and on the presupposition of an Alexandrian view of the world, with which the idea of a resurrection does not suit, although it has to be admitted that the author "keeps" it and "does not deny" it.

highest promises (*a*). These promises are, to be sure, those of the old prophets; but by the appearance of Christ they have received new light and new security for their fulfilment (*b*). The knowledge is hence, at the same time, a knowledge of Christ as our Messianic Lord and Saviour, who with divine power has given us all things necessary for salvation, and by the cleansing and deliverance from sin secured by Him has guaranteed to us the consummation of salvation (*c*). To this consummation, therefore, faith too has reference, and this faith, like an invaluable gift given by Christ, has to be kept true (*d*).

(*a*) In the Second Epistle of Peter, Christianity is presented mainly on its subjective side, as in the Pastoral Epistles (§ 107, *a*), as knowledge. By it the Christians have escaped from the pollutions of the world (ii. 20); by it, grace and salvation are multiplied to them (i. 2); in it their Christian life increases (iii. 18), because through it everything which pertains to the new life is given to them (i. 3).[1] But this knowledge is by no means an insight in any way into transcendental mysteries, and has nothing therefore to do with Alexandrian speculation (§ 112, *c*). For if grace and salvation are to be multiplied by such knowledge to the Christian, it is self-evident that they have received both by this knowledge, *i.e.* that this knowledge is even the knowledge of the grace of God which bringeth salvation. This, too, follows from iii. 18, according to which increase in the Christian life depends objectively on faith, subjectively on the knowledge of Christ, as of Him through whom this grace becomes ours.[2] That God has therefore bestowed His favour on us, and with it has given all blessedness, is what we recognise in Christ. In i. 3, Christian knowledge is expressly described as the knowledge of Him who has called us, *i.e.* has

[1] In conformity with this Christianity is said to be the way of truth, ii. 2, *i.e.* the way of life corresponding to the truth (i. 12) given to us. In Jude 5, also, the readers are such as have once for all known all things, if πάντα is naturally and in conformity with the context to be confined to all which the author has to say to them.

[2] We are not thereby, to be sure, to think of grace in the specifically Pauline sense (§ 75), but of the divine favour given to us in Christ, as with Peter (§ 45, *b*); then only is grace, as a blessing of salvation, regarded as capable of a constant increase, as also in Jude, ver. 4, it appears as a blessing which may be misdirected and misused.

appointed us to the consummation of salvation by His δόξα καὶ ἀρετή (comp. 1 Pet. ii. 9: τὰς ἀρετὰς . . . τοῦ καλέσαντος), while He has given us by the same the greatest and most precious promises (ver. 4).[3]

(*b*) The promises which are given us in Christianity (i. 4) are, as § 115, *a*, not new promises, but, as is clear from iii. 13, those contained in the words of the holy prophets of the Old Testament (ver. 2).[4] These, that is to say, being moved by the Holy Spirit, have spoken what they received of God (i. 21: ἐλάλησαν ἀπὸ Θεοῦ ἄνθρωποι). But this prophetic word is, to be sure, of itself only a light which sheds a feeble light in a dark place, because every prophecy of the Scripture, in so far as it is given of God, is by no means perfectly comprehended in its relations by its receiver (1 Pet. i. 10–12; comp. § 46, *a*, footnote 1); it receives its interpretation only when the day for its fulfilment comes, and the clear light of its complete understanding rises like the morning star upon the heart (vv. 19, 20). The promises contained in the prophetic word are given, so to speak, in so far new to the Christian (ver. 4), because by the manifestation of Christ the promise has begun to be fulfilled (§ 45), and thereby the portion of the promise yet remaining has become on the one hand clearer, and on the other more certain. The apostles, that is to say, on the ground of what they themselves saw and heard on the holy mount (*i.e.* at His transfiguration, and not after His resurrection, as Gess, p. 418, after Hofmann, supposes), when Christ appeared to them in His glory, and a voice declared Him to be the Messiah, proclaimed the divine fulness of power in Christ (comp. ver. 3)

[3] According to Jude 1, also, Christians are called, and it is in God, *i.e.* their Father (comp. ver. 4: ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν), that they are kept beloved (ἠγαπημένοι) and from falling (comp. ver. 24). We must keep ourselves, therefore, in this love of God (ver. 21), so that that love, along with the salvation (εἰρήνη) given by God's mercy in the calling through Christ, may be ever more richly increased (ver. 2). Although Peter knows of the calling to sonship (§ 45, *d*), yet this emphasizing of the divine love (comp. § 83, *a*), like the *term.* κλητοί (§ 88, *a*), reminds one of Paul.

[4] The Epistle of Jude reckons even Enoch among these prophets, in that it cites the apocalyptic book circulating under this name as true, and therefore prophetic (vv. 14, 15), as he also knew of the apocalyptic *Ascensio Mosis*, and uses it as trustworthy (ver. 9; comp. 2 Pet. ii. 11 and ver. 16, where Balaam also is called a prophet).

as that is to be revealed at His Messianic coming (vv. 16–18). A new light is therewith, on the one hand, thrown on the way in which the prophetic word (by means of Christ's Parousia; comp. also iii. 4) is fulfilled; and, on the other hand, this fulfilment has itself received a new security, so that we now possess the prophetic word as more sure (i. 19). If the prophetic word has, through the knowledge of Christ above everything else, become clearer and surer, then is hope, just as with Peter (§ 51), put into the central point of the Christian doctrine.

(*c*) If the prophetic word has received new light and new certainty by the appearance of Christ, it follows *à priori* that the knowledge of God, as of Him who has given us afresh these promises, must be at the same time a knowledge of Christ (i. 2), in whom He has given us them afresh, and it is hence expressly designated as such (i. 8, ii. 20, iii. 18). But Jesus is thereby acknowledged in His Messianic quality, in the first place, as our Lord (i. 2, 8; comp. vv. 14, 16; Jude 4, 17, 21, 25), or as the divine Lord simply (ὁ κύριος, iii. 2; comp. ii. 20), even as the only Lord (ὁ μόνος δεσπότης, Jude 4; comp. ii. 1).[5] As such is He praised by a doxology, iii. 18, as Jude refers it, to the only God (ver. 25); and His power, as the apostles proclaim it (i. 16), is a θεία δύναμις (ver. 3), because it can provide to us all that is needful for salvation. But as the Messianic Lord He is also the Messianic Saviour (ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν καὶ σωτήρ, i. 1, 11, iii. 18; comp. ii. 20, iii. 2: ὁ κύριος καὶ σωτήρ),[6] and even therein is the security to the Christian for the con-

[5] He can be Lord in the fullest sense, namely, as exalted to divine Lordship, since κύριος here also occurs very often of God (ii. 9, 11, iii. 8, 9, 10; Jude 14; comp. vv. 5, 9: ὁ κύριος; iii. 15: ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν), as § 50, *a*. Elsewhere in both Epistles Jesus is only Ἰησοῦς Χριστός; the reading Ἰησοῦς (Jude 5) and Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς (ver. 1) are, without doubt, incorrect. According to the common reading, He would be called even Θεός; but then the reading ought to be κύριος. He is never called by Peter ὁ υἱὸς Θεοῦ (i. 1); only in i. 17, with reference to the divine voice declaring Him the Son of God in the Messianic sense (note *b*), is God called πατήρ (comp. 1 Pet. i. 2, 3, and therewith § 50, *a*, footnote 1). On the other hand, Θεὸς πατήρ, in Jude 1, refers to the sonship of Christians (footnote 3).

[6] Even by Paul Christ is called *our* σωτήρ, especially in the Pastoral Epistles (§ 108, *a*), where also God is so called (comp. Jude 25: ὁ σωτὴρ ἡμῶν διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ), while here He is uniformly called simply σωτήρ, which for the thing agrees with the Petrine teaching (§ 50, *d*; comp. also Acts v. 31, and therewith § 40, *d*).

summation of salvation, which is throughout given with salvation from destruction. How far we have this security in Him is clear from i. 9, when it is presupposed that the Christian has cleansing from his former sins, and from ii. 1, where Christ is designated as the Lord who bought us.[7]

(*d*) With the knowledge of the promises given us through Christ, promises to whose fulfilment God has called us (i. 3, 4), there is connected, as is presupposed, ver. 5, faith, which here also, as with Peter (§ 44, *a*, footnote 2), and especially in the Epistle to the Hebrews (§ 125, *b*), is regarded essentially as confidence in the fulfilment of the promise. If Jude 3 exhorts to contend for the faith, then the whole Epistle, in which doctrinal questions are nowhere dealt with, shows that we are not thereby to think of any doctrine of faith, but of an earnest striving, by which the temptation of morally falling away, rendering the common σωτηρία (ver. 3) in the end in vain, and therefore making the confidence on the consummation of salvation illusory, is overcome (v. 4). Faith is here, therefore, thought of as a blessing (as 2 Pet. i. 1),[8] and even an irreparable one, because this blessing, once delivered by the apostles to the Christian Church of the present (τοῖς ἁγίοις), if it comes to be lost, cannot be replaced by any other of equal value. Only as the most precious blessing, and

[7] As the consciousness of being cleansed from sin appears, according to i. 8, as a part of the knowledge of Christ, the thought is evidently of that cleansing from the guilt of sin (comp. § 123, *a*), effected by the sprinkling with the blood of Christ (1 Pet. i. 2; comp. § 49, *c*), as also ii. 1 reminds one of the Petrine λύτρωσις (§ 49, *d*), *i.e.* of the deliverance from the dominion of sin, which salvation secures to us. Hence Schenkel, p. 371, asserts quite arbitrarily that the emphasis does not here lie on the sacrificial death of Christ, but on the value of His life, and that cleansing from sin is brought about only by baptism.

[8] Then, too, faith is regarded as a gift given through Christ (comp. 1 Pet. i. 21), and in so far as it conditions the consummation of salvation, as a most precious gift. The passage is only to be explained in this way, that the Jewish-Christian author writes to the Gentile Christians, who, on the ground of the appearance of Christ, have attained a confidence of the same consummation of salvation as the Jewish Christians, a confidence therefore equally precious, and that this is traced back to the righteousness of Christ, which gives salvation to Jew and Gentile with equal impartiality (read τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν καὶ σωτῆρος; comp. Gess, p. 421). On the other hand, there is no ground to take πίστις here or in the Epistle of Jude in an objective sense, as Schmid, ii. pp. 216, 142, wishes; at the same time μὴ πιστεύσαντες designates, without doubt, the want of trust on God, on account of which the murmuring generation of the desert perished (comp. Num. xiv.).

hence one to be protected with the holiest earnestness, is faith also called, Jude 20, ἁγιώτατος;[9] and if it is here designated as the foundation on which the whole Christian moral life is built, there is in this implied only the fundamental thought of our Epistle, according to which knowledge or faith, for the sake of their objects, are the impelling motives for all striving after Christian virtue.

§ 128. *The Striving after Christian Virtue.*

Christian knowledge is shown as fruitful, when the proclamation of the salvation given in Christ stirs up zeal to strive after Christian virtue (*a*). That is to say, while this knowledge presents to us the promises, for the attainment of which we are appointed, it makes that attainment dependent on this, that we keep ourselves unspotted, and so by means of the promising and commanding word of God, it stirs up zeal to secure their fulfilment for us in the way pointed out (*b*). The essence of Christian morality consists partly, in general, in piety and righteousness springing from the fear of God, and partly, in particular, in love, especially brotherly love (*c*). The exhortation to strive after Christian virtue was all the more pressing at a time, when a libertinism in principle had made its appearance, a libertinism which in its false doctrine of liberty showed already the germ of an un-Christian heresy (*d*).

(*a*) He who lacks zeal to contribute his own moral energy (ἀρετή) with his faith, to what the divine ἀρετή (i. 3) has done for his complete salvation (ver. 5), proves himself to be dull and unfruitful in reference to the knowledge of Christ (ver. 8), like an unfruitful tree (Jude 12). True knowledge must

[9] Everything which comes from God is primarily designated in our Epistle as holy, as § 84, *d*, footnote 14, such as the Spirit of God (Jude 20; 2 Pet. i. 21) and the divine commandment (ii. 21); so also everything which belongs to God in a special sense, as His angels (Jude 14; comp. § 64, *a*), His prophets (iii. 2; comp. Luke i. 70, § 106, *a*), and Christians (Jude 3), whose walk must therefore be holy (iii. 11). But as even the Mount of Transfiguration is called, i. 18, holy because it has received a higher consecration through the experience of the apostle there (comp. Acts vii. 33, xxi. 28, vi. 13; Matt. xxiv. 15), so also, Jude 20, the predicate of ἁγιότης appears as the designation of a higher consecration, which this incomparable blessing is to have in the eyes of Christians.

therefore bear fruit for the moral life. One must be quite blind, or else very short-sighted and forgetful, if the knowledge that he has been cleansed from sin through Christ does not move him to avoid sin (i. 9). Whoever gives himself up to the false doctrine of liberty has denied the Lord, as though he had never known that He had delivered him from the dominion of sin (ii. 1).[1] By the knowledge of the calling given us is everything bestowed on us which pertains to a true life, *i.e.* a life acceptable to God (i. 3; comp. Luke xv. 24, 32). Such a life is therefore the fruit of knowledge required, ver. 8. So far now as the preaching of the gospel with its promises produces this fruitful knowledge, these promises may be designated as that by which we are (born again, and so) made partakers (ver. 4) of the divine nature (that is to say, of God's peculiar *ἁγιότης*; comp. § 45, *d*, footnote 6). Here also, as by Peter (§ 46, *a*), an immediate divine power must be ascribed to the word of the gospel proclamation, if, according to ver. 3, the *θεία δύναμις* of Christ, by the knowledge of our calling, gives us all that pertains to a true life; for this knowledge is imparted to us only by that proclamation.

(*b*) In consequence of the operation of God, which made use of the preaching of the gospel to evoke the knowledge that is both fruit-bearing and renewing, Christians have escaped from the stains with which the world, by quickening sinful desires in men, pollutes them (ii. 20: *ἀποφυγόντες τὰ μιάσματα τοῦ κόσμου ἐν ἐπιγνώσει*; comp. ver. 18), and also the destruction which rules in the world in consequence of these sinful lusts (*ἡ ἐν κόσμῳ ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ φθορᾶς*, i. 4).[2]

[1] Even in the First Epistle of Peter, it was stated how deliverance from the guilt of sin (ii. 24), and along with that the death of Christ Himself (i. 19), has actually also delivered us from sin and made us free (§ 49, *d*). Whoever is confirmed in Christian truth must know, according to 2 Pet. i. 12, that for the consummation of salvation there is need of striving after Christian virtue, by which knowledge is shown to be fruitful (vv. 5–11). But the unfruitful trees are said (Jude 12) to be twice dead, because they, being rooted up, can never again come to life.

[2] The idea of the *κόσμος* does not here designate, as with Paul (§ 67, *a*), the world of men under the dominion of sin, but, as in the early apostolic system of doctrine (§ 46, *b*, footnote 3; 55, *a*), the totality of creaturely existence, the present condition of the world (comp. also Heb. iv. 3, ix. 26, x. 5), so far as the enticing allurement to sin proceeds from it. The old condition of the world

Christians, therefore, no doubt in virtue of the destination to complete salvation given them by their calling, know themselves to be elected from the total mass of sinful men; but their calling and election has to be made sure (ver. 10) by zeal in the manifestation of that fruitful knowledge (ver. 5), *i.e.* the realization of the end thereby intended has to be assured.[3] This happens, that is to say, in that the view of the promises given therewith quickens zeal to keep oneself even now holy and unspotted (comp. § 123, *b*), after one has by the power of God been once made partaker of His divine nature, *i.e.* become holy (i. 4), so that one may look for the final decision in peace, *i.e.* without anxiety, the decision which definitely settles the obtaining of what is promised (iii. 11, 14; comp. Jude 21). If this keeping, in virtue of which alone we can draw near joyfully to God's judgment-seat (Jude 24), is referred to the power of God (comp. ver. 1), then our Epistles give ground enough to understand this, with Peter (§ 46, *a*), of the work of God by His word. In the knowledge of Christ (ii. 20) we have received a holy command (*i.e.* one coming from God), which points out to us the way of righteousness (ver. 21). This command of Christ, the Messianic Lord and Saviour, which has been delivered to us by the apostles (iii. 2), and which likewise has been enjoined by Paul, according to the wisdom given him, in all his Epistles (vv. 15, 16), requires us to keep ourselves unspotted, in view of the expected final consummation (ver. 14).[4]

which perished with the flood (ii. 5, iii. 6), is expressly designated as the κόσμος ἀσεβῶν (ii. 5), in order to characterize it as filled with godless men. As for bringing into prominence sinful lust as the characteristic quality of pre-Christian life, comp. § 46, *b*; 56, *a*; but also § 66, *c*.

[3] This placing of κλῆσις first, shows that the ideas of election and calling have not been put in the Pauline way (§ 88), but in the Petrine way (§ 45, *b*, footnote 2), to designate the same divine act from a different side. As here it is knowledge of the promises given to us in our Christian calling, so with Peter it is (§ 51, *d*) hope, which is the motive for all striving after Christian virtue.

[4] If this commandment, transmitted in writing by Paul, is put into a position of equal authority with the word of the Old Testament Scriptures (iii. 16), then, according to ver. 2, the Lord's commandment, transmitted by the apostles agreeing therewith, is put side by side with the prophecies of the prophets; and from both passages it is clear, that here, as with Peter (§ 46, *a*), the preaching of the apostles is ever such a word of God, as is the word of God of the Old Testament (comp. also § 89, *a*; 116, *b*). As such, that commandment is likewise regarded as working with the power of God, like the word of the perfect law in

(*c*) *Εὐσέβεια* here, as in the Pastoral Epistles, forms the deepest root of Christian morality (§ 107, *c*); in it is the nature of the true life (i. 3; comp. note *a*) comprehended. Moral energy (*ἀρετή*), that is to say, is not sufficient, unless intelligent knowledge (*γνῶσις*), in the sense of 1 Pet. iii. 7, is added (ver. 5), which prescribes to it the right way of its activity. But even this is of no avail without the power of self-government (*ἐγκράτεια*), as otherwise natural passion gets the better of intelligent knowledge; and without the power of patience (*ὑπομονή*), which does not allow the temptation of outward suffering to hinder the intelligent activity of moral power. But every form of natural knowledge and strength are of no avail without the God-fearing mind of true piety (*εὐσέβεια*), as it alone gives to moral effort its true worth (ver. 6). This piety only produces the normal condition of a life of *δικαιοσύνη*, well-pleasing to God, the manifestation of which (*ὁδὸς δικαιοσύνης*: ii. 21) the divine law requires, and which hence must be perfectly realized in the consummation of the end (iii. 13).[5] But brotherly love (i. 7: *φιλαδελφία*; comp. § 47, *a*), necessarily springing from the fact of the new filial relation, is peculiar to Christianity (§ 127, *a*), and also that general love (i. 7: *ἀγάπη*) which goes beyond the circle of Christian brethren (i. 10, iii. 15).

(*d*) The Epistle of Jude is essentially directed against a form of heathenish godlessness (*ἀσέβεια*: vv. 4, 15, 18; comp. 2 Pet. ii. 6, iii. 7), whose peculiarity is the walk in lusts (Jude 16, 18; comp. iii. 3), in particular, in the defiling lusts of the flesh (ii. 18; comp. vv. 10, 13, 14; Jude 7, 8, 23),

James (§ 52). Only the way in which, according to Jude 20, this preserving oneself in the love of God, to which, in view of the expectation of a final decision, Christians are exhorted (ver. 21), is regarded as brought about by prayer in the Holy Spirit, reminds one of the Pauline doctrine of the Holy Spirit (comp. ver. 19), since the Spirit is mentioned, 2 Pet. i. 21, only as the source of prophecy.

[5] And so the *εὐσεβεῖς* form the contrast to the *ἄδικοι* (ii. 9); and the individual forms of *εὐσέβεια* are identical with different manifestations of a walk consecrated to God (ii. 11: *ἁγίαι ἀναστροφαί*; comp. 1 Pet. i. 15), in which participation in the divine nature is realized. *Εὐσέβεια* and *δικαιοσύνη* likewise correspond to each other in the Pastoral Epistles (§ 108, *c*), and quite analogously the fear of God and righteousness in Peter (§ 45, *c*), at the same time here also, as there, the two are by no means characteristic of the Christian life; the Old Testament pious were rather *εὐσεβεῖς* (ii. 9) and *δίκαιοι* (ii. 7, 8; comp. ii. 5).

and in covetousness (ii. 14; comp. ver. 3) — specifically heathenish sins (§ 69, *d*).[6] With this godlessness is conjoined a moral licence, which considered itself bound by no law (ii. 7: ἡ τῶν ἀθέσμων—comp. iii. 17—ἐν ἀσελγείᾳ—comp. ii. 2, 18—ἀναστροφή), and that on principle; for if these libertines turned the grace of God to ἀσέλγεια (Jude 4), then they must have found in their state of grace a justification for such licence, and, from ver. 19, it is clear that they claimed to be the really spiritual.[7] Inasmuch now as the Christian has to follow the commandments of Christ as His Lord, this libertinism can only be characterized as a despising and a denying of the Lordship of Christ (vv. 4, 8; comp. ii. 1, 10), for whom the called like true subjects are kept (ver. 1); but, in so far as it at the same time brings under the power of the devil, it is characterized as a shameful despising of demoniac powers (δόξαι: vv. 8–10; comp. ii. 10, 11). But only in the Second Epistle of Peter does this libertinism appear expressly as the preacher of a false liberty (ii. 17–19), which seeks support from misunderstood or perverted passages of Paul and the Old Testament (iii. 16).[8]

[6] We saw, § 69, *b*, that even with Paul ἀσέβεια is the characteristic of heathenism. The Second Epistle of Peter, which borrows from the Epistle of Jude the characteristic of those libertines, appears to have selected in contrast to this the designation of the fear of God as εὐσέβεια (instead of φόβος θεοῦ, used in the Old Testament and by Peter, § 45, *c*). To the fleshly lusts of these libertines belongs also debauchery, with which they desecrated the love feasts (Jude 12; comp. ii. 13). Beginnings of this we found even in the Corinthian church (§ 85, *d*). Σάρξ, moreover, stands throughout in our Epistles in its own (ii. 10, 18; Jude 7, 8, 23), never in the specific Pauline sense (comp. § 27).

[7] If they are designated in this passage as those that make separations (οἱ ἀποδιορίζοντες), it is clear from what follows that they distinguished between the natural and the spiritual, and reckoned themselves among the latter, while the author asserts that they are but natural, who have not the spirit in truth as the higher principle, because they give themselves up altogether to natural impulse. Ψυχή therefore appears to be used here in opposition to πνεῦμα quite in the Pauline sense (§ 68), while, ii. 8, 14, ψυχή, as throughout in the early apostolic type of doctrine (§ 27), the soul is designated as the bearer of the higher life in man.

[8] The author is afraid that this doctrine of a false liberty may shape itself in the future into a definite theory, and form a propaganda successful in the highest degree and soul-destructive; for as once false prophets arose among the people, so there will not be awanting false teachers (ψευδοδιδάσκαλοι) even among the New Testament people of God (ii. 1–3; comp. § 45, *a*). It is perhaps in view of these germinating false doctrines, just as in the Pastoral Epistles, that Christianity is by preference conceived of as ἐπίγνωσις (§ 127, *a*).

§ 129. *The Destruction of the World and the Consummation of Salvation.*

Every divine judgment of the past is but a type of the final judgment, which on the great day of the Lord brings all the godless, even those of the past, finally to destruction (*a*). On that day, that is to say, the present world perishes in fire, which carries away those who have sunk into the corruption of the world (*b*). At His Parousia, which is deferred only to give Christians room for repentance, Christ appears as the Saviour from this destruction (*c*). Then the eternal kingdom begins in the new world, into which those Christians zealous for virtue enter for their reward, there to live for ever as saved (*d*).

(*a*) While Jude refers the prophecy of the Book of Enoch of the divine judgment (vv. 14, 15) to the ἀσεβεῖς of his own day (§ 128, *d*: ἐπροφήτευσεν καὶ τούτοις), he can say that the libertines have been for long destined for this judgment (ver. 4), which hands them over, that is to say, as ἀσεβεῖς to the judgment of God, and henceforth will not be slow to assign them final destruction (ii. 3). Bodily death forms an emblem of this destruction (ἀπώλεια, 3, 7, 9, 16), which, as § 34, *c*, 57, *d*, is in the first place regarded as a sudden and violent end; under it the generation of the people of Israel, that were delivered from Egypt, fell, because, on account of their unbelief, they were not delivered a second time (Jude 5); the sudden perishing of the company of Korah (ver. 11), or the dreadful end which overtook Noah's contemporaries in the great flood (ii. 5; comp. § 50, *d*). A yet more definite emblem is to be found in the perishing of Sodom and Gomorrah (ii. 6: ὑπόδειγμα μελλόντων ἀσεβεῖν), inasmuch as these cities burn in an inextinguishable fire under the sea which covers them (Jude 7). In conformity with this, accordingly, destruction, as § 34, *d*, 126, *b*, is regarded under the symbol of fire, as a judgment of God. If, finally, the emblematic divine judgment does not spare even the angels who were guilty of unnatural unchastity with the daughters of men, Gen. vi., and for which they are bound in the prison of Hades (ταρταρώσας) with everlasting chains, and reserved with deep darkness (Jude 6, 2, 4), destruction

is thus regarded as the thickest darkness, *i.e.* as the deepest misery (§ 34, *d*), as Jude 13, where the libertines are pictured as wandering stars, for whom the blackness of darkness is reserved for ever (comp. ii. 17). All these acts of judgment are, that is to say, but preliminary: wicked angels (ii. 4), as all the godless, are only kept, so to speak, in their provisional prison for the judgment of the great day (Jude 6), *i.e.* the day of judgment (ii. 9, iii. 7), which is here, according to the way of the old prophets, spoken of as the day of the Lord (*ἡμέρα κυρίου*, iii. 10, 12; comp. § 40, *d*), because on it God with His myriads of angels (comp. Heb. xii. 22) appears as the Judge of the world (Jude 14, 15), before whom in His glory all stand, to receive their decisive sentence (ver. 24).

(*b*) But the whole present state of the world has fallen under *φθορά*,[1] and it is therefore, as with Paul (§ 99, *b*), appointed to destruction. The way in which the author more exactly regards the impending destruction of the world, it has been unnecessarily sought to explain from the contemporary philosophical ideas. Quite in harmony with the account in Gen. iii. 5, he regards the heaven and the earth in their original form as proceeding by the creative word of God from the waters of Chaos (Gen. i. 2), and this in such a way that the origin of the heavens was brought about by the separation of the waters (vv. 7, 8), and the origin of the land by the gathering together of the waters (vv. 9, 10). This old world perished by the waters of the flood (iii. 6; comp. ii. 5), and the present form of the world is protected by God's word of promise (Gen. ix. 11) against any recurring flood (iii. 7). Yet if it, too, is to perish, there remains now only fire as the element to bring about this destruction; and as, according to note *a*, on the ground of Old Testament representations, the wrathful judgment of God is regarded as a consuming fire, it is easy to think, that the destruction of the world resulting from the day of judgment will be brought about by fire in a

[1] It is hence said, i. 4, that those born again have escaped the *φθορά* ruling in the world (§ 128, *b*), while those, who but by instinct, so to speak, like the irrational animals, understand only earthly things, while they turn such things to mere personal gratification, have thereby fallen under the *φθορά* appointed for such things (*ἐν τούτοις φθείρονται*: Jude 10; comp. ii. 12, 19).

special sense, for which this present form of the world is, so to speak, reserved (ver. 7). On the day of the Lord the heavens will be dissolved in fire, and will pass away with a noise; their firm elements, by which, perhaps, he is thinking of the stars, will melt with the heat, and the earth with all its works will be burnt up (vv. 10, 12). Since, now, the godless will be destroyed on that day (ver. 7), and, according to ver. 12, on account of the coming of the day of judgment the destruction of the world follows, there is here quite evidently implied the idea that the destruction of the world removes even the godless (comp. § 126, *b*, with § 33, *c*), and hands them over to destruction as to death, from which there is no more any deliverance.

(*c*) The day of judgment and of the destruction of the world is infallibly at the same time the day of Christ's Parousia, which the apostles, according to i. 16, proclaimed, and therefore His coming is designated, iii. 12, by this technical expression (§ 57, *c*; 63, *d*; 98, *a*, footnote 1).[2] If Jude applies the apostolic prophecy of a frivolous moral laxity, which should appear ἐπ' ἐσχάτου τοῦ χρόνου, *i.e.* at the end of the pre-Messianic period of the world, as it also occurs, 2 Tim. iii. 1 ff. (comp. § 110, *a*), to the libertines of his own day (vv. 17, 18), it is clear from this that he believes himself already standing in that last time. The last time has also come in the view of the Second Epistle of Peter, as in that of Peter (§ 48, *a*) and of the Epistle to the Hebrews (§ 117, *c*); nay, it has even already far advanced, since in the reproduction of that prophecy he refers it directly to the last day (iii. 3: ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν). He expects above all for these days frivolous scoffers, who will throw doubt on the coming of the Parousia generally, because it had not come

[2] But Christ appears, according to § 127, *c*, as the Redeemer, as in Peter (§ 50, *d*) and in the Epistle to the Hebrews (§ 126, *c*), or at least, as Jude 25, as the Mediator of redemption from the judgment and from the destruction of the world, from which the righteous are to be taken away, but so that they are delivered directly by the resurrection from death (comp. § 34, *b*). It is this deliverance which is common to all Christians (Jude 3), the type of which was the deliverance of Israel from Egypt (ver. 5), by which even the seduced may be delivered, by their being snatched as a brand from the fire (ver. 23). It is hence from the above quite arbitrary, when Baur, p. 319 f., asserts that our Epistle shows a complete abandonment of the original hope of the Parousia

during the first Christian generation, during which it was expected; and generally any change on the present form of the world, which had already stood so long, was not to be looked for (iii. 3, 4; comp. § 112, *b*).[3] But the polemic against such anticipated doubt was all the more necessary, as complaints had already begun to be made in the Church as to the delay of the Parousia, to which the author objects that the postponement was no delay, but an act of God's long-suffering, as He would lead even those Christians who had fallen away to repentance (§ 21; 40, *b*; 124, *c*), and so would save them from destruction (ver. 9). If God, therefore, according to His long-suffering towards lost Christianity, had by this postponement of the judgment given time for a second repentance, as He once gave to the people of Israel, in addition to their first repentance (§ 42, *b*), then they ought to look at God's long-suffering as a ground for their salvation (ver. 15), and so to hasten the coming of the day of the Lord in this way, that by their holy walk they would render any further delay for repentance unnecessary (ver. 12). But from this also it is clear, the approaching end is a motive to strive after Christian virtue (§ 128, *b*).

(*d*) With the Parousia the eternal kingdom of Christ begins (i. 11; comp. § 110, *b*), and, according to the fundamental principle of the doctrine of retribution (§ 32, *b*; 51, *d*; 57, *b*), the entrance into that kingdom is represented as an equivalent reward (ἐπιχορηγηθήσεται), for this, that the Christian has done his part (ver. 5 : ἐπιχορηγήσατε) to make his election firm (ver. 10).[4] Christians, moreover, are at the judgment by no means free from all defects, and therefore expect at it the mercy of their Lord Christ (Jude 21) to save them (comp. Jas. ii. 13, and therewith § 57, *b*). But the eternal

[3] If the author directs this teaching of his regarding the destruction of the old world by the flood (note *b*) against the latter objection to be expected as to the destruction of the world that was at hand, he makes it good against the former, that, according to Ps. xc. 4, the divine measure of time is different from the human, and therefore God cannot be bound in the determination of the Parousia by a time fixed by a human measure (iii. 8). But the day of the Lord will certainly come, and when quite unlooked for, like a thief in the night (ver. 10; comp. § 33, *a*).

[4] On the other hand, the destruction of the godless is the recompense of their unrighteousness (ii. 13), which they received on this account, that, like Balaam,

kingdom of Christ begins, on the ground of the promise (Isa. lxv. 17), in the new heaven and the new earth, in which righteousness dwells; therefore the highest ideal is realized (iii. 13), and the eternal life is given to them (Jude 21). The perfect kingdom is therefore also no earthly one, as the present form of the world has passed away (comp. § 34, *a*; 99, *b*; 126, *d*). From the point of view of this future expectation, the earthly life looks like a pilgrim life, as with Peter (§ 51, *a*, footnote 1), our body like a pilgrim's tent, which we strike in order to enter the eternal home (i. 13, 14; comp. 2 Cor. v. 1, 4, 6, 8).

SECTION III.

THE JOHANNEAN APOCALYPSE.

CHAPTER VI.

THE APOCALYPTIC PICTURE OF THE FUTURE.

Comp. B. Weiss, *Apocalyptische Studien* (*Stud. u. Krit.* 1869, 1); Hilgenfeld, *in seiner Zeitschrift*, 1869, 4.

§ 130. *The Precursors of Christ's Second Coming.*

The Apocalypse will reveal the immediate future, the central point of which is occupied by Christ's coming to judgment, which is immediately at hand (*a*). As precursors, it designates a series of preparatory judgments of God, whose object is, in vain, to be sure, to rouse the unbelieving world to repentance (*b*). But the Church of God also, gathered out of all

they sinned for the sake of earthly enjoyment, because they loved the wages of unrighteousness (ver. 15; Jude 11). But as, according to § 32, *d*, the greatness of the sin depends on the greatness of the motive one had to avoid guilt, it were better for the backsliding Christians never to have known the way of righteousness, because now, when the end has become worse than the beginning (comp. Matt. xii. 45), their punishment may be only the more severe (ii. 20–23).

nations, the heir of Israel's promises, which continues preserved in the presence of all these plagues, has to endure severe trials, and many even of her members shall perish as martyrs (*c*). In the meanwhile, the time for the rule of the Gentiles over Israel has also come, from which, after new exhortations to repentance and new judgments of God, a remnant at least is saved (*d*).

(*a*) The Apocalypse is the book of the future of Christendom. The author has seen what is to take place after the present (iv. 1), and he writes it down at Christ's command (i. 19). It is, however, no far distant future about which it will make disclosures, but one immediately at hand (i. 1, xxii. 6: ἃ δεῖ γενέσθαι ἐν τάχει; comp. Luke xviii. 8), the fulfilment of its prophecy is near at hand (i. 3, xxii. 10: ὁ καιρὸς ἐγγύς). And thus all explanations of the Apocalypse fall at once to the ground, according to which any long development of centuries is to be kept in the eye, whether that be thought of as a historical development of a history of the world, or Church, or kingdom. As any such prophecy would be completely isolated in the midst of the other prophecies of an entirely different kind from Biblical prophecy, so would it be without any point of connection, and without any basis in its own time. As everywhere in the New Testament the coming of Christ forms, that is to say, the centre-point of the apocalyptic view of the future, with this coming is the end connected (ἄχρις οὗ ἂν ἥξω: ii. 25 = ver. 26: ἄχρι τέλους), and His coming to be seen in the clouds, as Daniel (vii. 13) and Zechariah (xii. 10) prophesied (i. 7; comp. § 19, *d*), which, as is shown by the howling of the inhabitants of the earth, brings the last judgment.[1] Since, now, all the writers of the New Testament think of this coming of Christ as near at hand, it would be incomprehensible how our book should form an exception to this. At any rate, it teaches the same thing, that Christ comes unexpectedly, like a thief (iii. 3; comp. § 33, *a*; 129, *c*, footnote 3); but even so is it said definitely, that He comes soon (iii. 11, xxii. 7, 12, 20: ἔρχομαι ταχύ), that therefore the end is at hand. In this short space between the

[1] From this last coming of Christ it has perhaps to be distinguished, when single preliminary judgments are so represented, that He comes and executes them (ii. 5, 16; comp. vv. 22, 23, iii. 3).

present and this near future, everything must therefore take place which the Apocalypse wishes to reveal.

(*b*) In the direct explanation of Christ's prophecy (§ 33, *b*), the Apocalypse, in the vision of the seals, makes three allegorical figures come forth from the book of the future, opened by Christ Himself, as attendants on Christ as He goes out to victory (vi. 1, 2); the three first allegorical figures precede, which set forth those precursors of His second coming, designated as the beginning of sorrows: war, famine, pestilence (vv. 3–8); and out of the sixth seal the earthquake along with the sign of the heavens, described by Him as the beginning of the overthrow of the world (vv. 12–14), which are understood by the inhabitants of the earth to be precursors of the approaching judgment (vv. 15–17).[2] More exact explanations as to the precise significance of those precursors of the judgment bring only two later visions. In the vision of the trumpets there are great plagues, after the manner of the Egyptian, which come upon the inhabitants of the earth (viii. 6–13, ix. 1–19). These plagues are regarded, on the one hand, as preliminary to the judgments of God, and especially the two last and greatest, the infernal locusts and the army of daemonic horsemen, are painted in fantastic way, fitted to awaken terror; as God's terrible scourge, they bring upon the inhabitants of the earth torment (ix. 5, 6) and death (ver. 18). On the other hand, these plagues are a last, although unsuccessful, attempt to move the world to repentance (vv. 20, 21), a πειρασμός (iii. 10), in which God tries whether even yet they may be quickened to repentance. Yet more explicitly are those plagues (xvi. 2–11) in the vision of the bowls (vials) (xv. 1, 3, 4, 7, xvi. 1, 5–7) set forth as wrathful destinies; but even here are they not regarded merely as judgments (comp. Messner, p. 366), but it is presupposed that they might have, and ought to have, led the inhabitants of the earth to

[2] How this vision of the seals rests entirely upon Christ's prophecy is shown also by the scene which the opening of the fifth seal brings (vi. 9–11), and which, as it is really only an illustration of Luke xviii. 7, 8, will say that the end is not to be thought of as immediately at hand, and why this is so. No doubt the martyrs of the time of Nero cry here for vengeance, but it does not follow from this that the vision of the seals represents a past time, as Gebhardt, p. 255 [E. T. 344], will have it, who also refers the vision of the bowls to the time of Antichrist, and only the vision of the trumpets to the intervening period.

repentance, although they have not done so (xvi. 9, 11; comp. ver. 21). Even the fall of Babylon, the last of these judgments which the seventh bowl brings (xvi. 17–21), ought yet to quicken the inhabitants of the earth to repentance (xiv. 8–11; comp. vv. 6, 7). These judgments and warnings to repentance, ever increasing in severity (comp. xvi. 3 with viii. 8, xvi. 4 with viii. 10, xvi. 10 with viii. 12), are therefore the precursors of His second coming prophesied by Christ.

(*c*) If the whole Apocalypse is connected with the prophecy and the typical figures of the Old Testament,[3] it is even thereby said that the Christian Church is but the continuation of the Old Testament Church of God, the promise of which is fulfilled in it (§ 115, *a*).[4] But the continuance of the true Israel, to be sure, in the present is no longer identical with the continuance of the actual nation. Unbelieving Jews, who persecute the Christians, give themselves out falsely as Jews; they are really the synagogue of Satan (ii. 9, iii. 9); they are excluded from the fellowship of Israel, from the theocracy, as it is perfected in Messianic times (§ 42, *b*; 44, *c*; 117, *b*). In the present continuance of the Church of God, Jewish Christianity no longer forms the central stock, as it does with Peter (§ 44, *d*); corresponding to the state (§ 112, *a*) of the seven small churches of Asia, to whom the Apocalypse is addressed (i. 4, 11), and which, without doubt, were essentially Gentile Christians, the Church seems gathered from all nations (v. 9, vii. 9, xiv. 3).[5] If, now, the Egyptian plagues of

[3] For the most part the author of the Apocalypse rests on Isaiah, after him on Ezekiel and Daniel, less on Jeremiah, Zechariah, and the Psalms; yet there are shown references to almost all the smaller prophets, to Job, the Proverbs, and the Pentateuch (comp. § 74, *a*; 116, *c*).

[4] The woman with the wreath of twelve stars round her head, who gives birth to the Messiah (xii. 1, 2, 5), is without doubt the Old Testament theocracy, as it was realized in the twelve national tribes; but it is at the same time after Messiah's birth the believing Church of Messiah (vv. 6, 13), whose seed (*i.e.* individual believers) it is whom Satan persecutes (ver. 17). This is the kingdom of priests, which is to be the Israel according to Ex. xix. 6 (i. 6; comp. § 45, *c*), who serve Jehovah as priests with the incense of their prayers (v. 8, viii. 3, 4; comp. Heb. xiii. 15), the first-fruits presented to God and Messiah (xiv. 4; comp. § 54, *b*; 61, *c*), the people of God (xviii. 4).

[5] If Baur, p. 212, supposes the Gentiles belong to the Christian fellowship only in so far as they are incorporated with the tribes of Israel, then it is only ideally the case, as with Paul (§ 90, *c*; 105, *b*), so far as the fellowship of the tribes of Israel is the abiding type of the true Church of God. It results simply from the

the preparatory judgments of God (note *b*) come over the inhabitants of the earth, the Church of God continues to be saved from them (ix. 4), as Israel was once in Egypt; the members of the Church are expressly designated as such with a seal, they hence continue preserved (vii. 2, 3), and even in the sealing the New Testament Church ever appears, according to the type of the Old Testament, a Church which is to keep its ideal identity with the latter, as a people of twelve tribes, out of each of which are sealed 12,000 (vv. 3–8).[6] But it is by no means to be therewith said that the Church of God continues preserved from the tribulations of the last time; rather only other hard trials threaten her.[7] In

historical situation of the Apocalypse, if the Gentiles, as they are represented by the Roman Empire, appear to be the special seat of hatred to Christ; for the synagogue of Satan equally appears incidentally (ii. 9, 13) as the persecutor of the Christians. But the author no more, at any rate, expects, according to note *b*, any comprehensive conversion of the Gentiles; probably in consequence of the Neronian persecution at that time, a stoppage of the mission to the Gentiles had taken place.

[6] As certainly the actual Israel no longer really consisted of the old twelve tribes, so certainly it could not be said that the Church of believers did not consist of an equal number of descendants from each of the old twelve tribes, but that these believers were the representatives of the old nation of the twelve tribes and the heir of its promises. To refer the 144,000 to the Jewish portion of the Church (Gess, p. 579 f.; Schenkel, p. 304), is utterly groundless (comp. on the other hand, Gebhardt, p. 203 f. [E. T. 193]). If the Messiah gathers about Him these 144,000 in order to march out with them to the last fight (xiv. 1, 3), so does He also take His stand upon the Mount Zion, the central-point of the Old Testament theocracy (ver. 1). But therewith also is represented but the Church of believers, as the ideal theocracy, while the holy hill of the Old Testament theocracy, which is not to be placed, with Gebhardt, p. 46 [E. T. 45], in heaven, is made ideally its central-point; for the actual Jerusalem has indeed become by the slaying of Messiah a Sodom or Egypt (xi. 8). It is simply from this point of view that the enemy of believers is ever designated by the name of the enemy of the old theocracy (Βαβυλών: xiv. 8, xvi. 19, xvii. 5, xviii. 2, 10, 21). The enemies are ever drawn out for the last fight over the Euphrates, and are collected at Armageddon (xvi. 12, 16; comp. ix. 14); the great decisive fight is fought outside the city (Jerusalem) (xiv. 20). But as certainly as this great battle-scene is but a description, shining in the glory of Old Testament imagery, of the final annihilation of the Roman Empire, so certainly is there no proof that Jerusalem is regarded locally as the central-point of the Christian Church.

[7] That Christians will have to endure severe tribulation in the last times (θλῖψις: i. 9, ii. 9, 10, vii. 14), is in the line of ordinary apostolic teaching (§ 51, *b*; 98, *a*) based on the prophecy of Christ (§ 30, *a*), and it is pure arbitrariness when Schenkel, p. 303, makes this tribulation come only on Gentile Christians for their purification. But this tribulation inflicted by unbelievers is something totally different from those plagues sent by God.

what ways these are thought of depends on the times of the author of the Apocalypse, when the world's power had begun with brutal power the struggle against Christianity (§ 113, *a*). The blood of many martyrs had even been shed (vi. 10, xvi. 6, xviii. 20, 24, xix. 2, xx. 4), but the number of these must be completed (vi. 11) in the struggle which Satan carries on against the Christians (xii. 17, xiii. 7, 10, 15), and innumerable martyrs will one day stand round the throne of God, and receive the reward (vii. 9–17) of their fidelity (ii. 10).

(*d*) While the Gentiles, as a whole impenitent, ripen for judgment (note *b*), the people of Israel have yet a future. To be sure, the capture of Jerusalem by the Gentiles stands already without question (xi. 1, 2); the supposition that the author hoped for the deliverance of the actual temple is, in view of Christ's prophecy (Mark xiii. 2), impossible. The temple of God in Jerusalem can therefore only be the believing Jewish Church itself, those whom even Christ had exhorted to sudden flight (Matt. xxiv. 16), and who now, according to the divine appointment (comp. the measuring, xi. 1, 2), are to be preserved from this judgment coming on Israel (xii. 6, 13–16), as, according to note *c*, the whole Church is preserved from the judgment on the heathen world.[8] On the other hand, the fore-court, or unbelieving Israel, is given up to the rule of the Gentiles (xi. 2), and, following the type of the time of disaster in Daniel (Dan. v. 25, xii. 17), this Gentile rule is to last $3\frac{1}{2}$ years. The overthrow

[8] That the Christian Church as such is with Paul the true temple of God, naturally cannot prevent this term being also transferred to the Jewish-Christian Church, as Hilgenfeld, p. 422, supposes; that Church had a temple of stone, but it is itself God's spiritual house, just as is the case with Peter (§ 45, *a*). That the Church, which as such forms the temple itself, is distinguished from its individual members, who then correspond to those worshipping in the temple, is in no respects different than when, chap. xii., the woman designates the Church, and her seed (ver. 17), the individual members of the Church, although the Church even consists of individual members. The literal explanation is, on the other hand, exegetically impossible, since not only must the temple buildings, but even the Jewish priesthood (*οἱ προσκυνοῦντες ἐν αὐτῷ*) be spared. But if Hilgenfeld wishes to escape this difficulty by the supposition that the seer saw the real believers from among Israel transported into the (real) temple officiating only as priests (p. 423), then this is an unexegetical intermingling of the literal and the symbolical. Comp. the correct interpretation in Gebhardt, p. 270 ff. [E. T. 257].

of Jerusalem is therefore no longer the immediate signal of the second coming, as § 33, *b*; the time of great tribulation, which believers have to expect (vii. 14), no longer coincides with this overthrow, but begins with it, and this period is given to Israel as a respite for repentance. As certainly, that is to say, as this rule of the Gentiles is a judgment of God on Israel, so has it the purpose, just as the plagues (note *b*), to lead Israel to repentance. Hence God sends at this time two prophets, like Moses and Elias, who, to be sure, as Christ was, will be slain by the Gentiles, but will be raised and exalted to heaven (xi. 3–12). If the last judgment now comes (comp. also xvi. 18, 19*a*), then, no doubt, will a great part of the nation perish, but the remnant will repent (xi. 13). The author of the Apocalypse no longer then ventures to hope, as Paul did (§ 91, *d*), for the final conversion of all Israel; but, conformably with the prophecy of the ancient prophets (Isa. i. 9, x. 22, 23; comp. Rom. ix. 27, 29), a remnant of Israel shall yet be saved.[9] Even amid the dispersion does he yet hope for the conversion of Jews (iii. 9).

§ 131. *The Apocalyptic Reckoning of the End.*

The God-defying power which, during the time of the last tribulation, persecutes Christians is the Roman Empire, as it was restored by the elevation of the Flavians to the dignity of Caesar, after the fall of the earlier Caesarean dynasty (*a*). In league with it were the false prophets, who moved the inhabitants of the earth to pay homage to the Roman Empire,

[9] Contrary to the plain words (comp. οἱ λοιποί), Gebhardt, p. 276 f. [E. T. 263], asserts that here the conversion of all Israel is expected, as Rom. xi. 25 ff. But Paul differs in this, that with him the conversion of all Israel follows the incoming of the fulness of the Gentiles, while here Israel's remnant is converted before the inhabitants of the earth repent. Only the author of the Apocalypse agrees again with the early apostolic expectation (§ 42, *a*), as he does with Paul (§ 98, *a*), in this, that with the final conversion of Israel (at the end of the time of the rule of the Gentiles over Israel, which is identical with the time of the great tribulation) there comes at once the Messianic judgment and the end of the world (xi. 14, 15), which, to be sure, is clear only when one acknowledges the relation of the seven visions of the Apocalypse explained above, and gets emancipated from the exegetically untenable and utterly confusing idea, that these describe a continuous series of events.

and seduced even the Christians to heathenish immorality (*b*). With the expiry of the series of seven-headed rulers the development appointed for the Roman Empire is now finished; the eighth, which then yet comes, can be but the final incarnation of antichristianity (*c*). Along with his royal helpers he will destroy even the chief city of the world, and will then be destroyed in the struggle with the returning Messiah (*d*).

(*a*) The God-defying power, which occasions the great tribulation to believers, is the same power which is presented in the rule of the Gentiles over Jerusalem, and then kills God's messengers; it is therefore the Roman Empire. This empire therefore appears even, xi. 7, as the beast out of the abyss. It is more exactly described, xiii. 1, 2, as the monster which rises out of the sea in the West, because Rome, according to Jewish ideas, lay on the islands of the sea; and unites in his form the forms of the four beasts, which, Dan. vii., represent the ungodly powers of the world, because it is to be regarded as the most developed form of manifestation, which unites in itself the might and the dominion of all four. On this very account it has *à priori* all the seven heads of the forms of the beasts of Daniel, three of which had one head each, while one had four heads; the ten horns also of Dan. vii. 24 are not lacking to it. The author of the Apocalypse farther on refers the horns to the governors of provinces, who finally appear with royal authority, and therefore wear kingly crowns (comp. note *d*). The heads refer to the bearers of imperial authority themselves, who, it was well known, did not assume the diadem; these, on the other hand, wear, xiii. 1, the name of blasphemy (Augustus-σεβαστός), and that in the view of the author of the Apocalypse points to divine honour. To this beast Satan has entrusted all his power and dominion over the world. This beast has, to be sure, received a deadly wound (xiii. 3, xii. 14) by the death of its head (Nero), as it seemed, after the overthrow of the first Caesarean dynasty, during the struggles of the interregnum, as though the empire would no more attain to its ancient power and enduring condition; but this deadly wound was healed by the elevation of Vespasian to the imperial power.[1] The

[1] The proposed interpretation, by which the healing of the deadly wound is supposed to refer to the return of the dead Nero, is exegetically untenable,

worldly power thus restored, which has once already persecuted the Christians, now receives power for the 3½ years to persecute the saints (xiii. 4–8) and to rule over Israel (xi. 2, 7). The restoration of the empire, which coincides nearly with the fall of Jerusalem, is also the commencement of the last time of great tribulation, which is not, in conformity with the symbolism of numbers in the Apocalypse, reckoned as a period of 3½ years, but only, in accordance with the type of the period of misfortune in Daniel, is characterized as such a time.[2]

(*b*) In league with the first beast there appears, xiii. 11, a second, which is designated by its two lamb's horns, a sort of counterpart of Christ; but, by its daemonic speech, is likewise characterized as an organ of Satan. It seduces the inhabitants of the earth by its lying wonders to worship the worldly power (vv. 12, 14, 16). The Apocalypse itself designates it repeatedly as the false prophet (xvi. 13, xix. 20), *i.e.* as the

because a distinction is made in the most definite way between the beast, which, as with Daniel, represents a collective idea, and his heads, which symbolize individual kings; while, for the first time, xvii. 11, the personification of the beast as such is indicated in an eighth ruler (and this did not occur under the heads); this Hilgenfeld, p. 426, and Gebhardt, p. 232 [E. T. 221], equally overlook. Similarly, a distinction is made in the most definite way between the slaying of the one head, *i.e.* the death of the one ruler, and the deadly wound which the beast has thereby received. But the former interpretation is historically untenable, since the original Nero-myths knew nothing of the death and resurrection of Nero, but only made him flee into Parthia, and return from thence. It is, moreover, a mere untenable evasion when Hilgenfeld would weaken the Christian-apocalyptical idea of Jews and Gentiles (?!) to a simple flight, and it is also when Gebhardt, p. 240 [E. T. 228], would modify (rather: completely change) the popular expectation accepted by him (?!) by the author of the Apocalypse. When Gebhardt, p. 234 [E. T. 222], renews the objection of Volkmar to the healing of the deadly wound by Vespasian, that the latter cannot be regarded as the founder of a new imperial dynasty, he overlooks the fact that his warlike son Titus, not to speak of Domitian, was already associated with him. Gess, however, p. 605 *f.*, has put denials without any foundation in opposition to the correct interpretation.

[2] When Hilgenfeld, p. 429, asks what Vespasian had done to justify the expectation that the time of the last tribulation should begin with him, it is indeed self-evident that Vespasian in his personal qualities does not here come into regard, but only as he is the bearer of the empire restored to its full power; an empire which, after Satan had once chosen it as his instrument, would, it was to be presumed, as soon as it is restored to power, carry forward its work begun under Nero (comp. moreover, note c). But if there is given to the beast, whose deadly wound is healed, a respite of 3½ years (and certainly not in the future, as Hilgenfeld has to assume on account of his mistaken

representative of false prophecy which appears specially as the spiritual power, by which the restored Roman Empire secures for itself the heathen world.[3] But Christ had also warned believers of false prophets (Mark xiii. 22), and had prophesied of false Messiahs (Matt. xxiv. 5; comp. § 33, *a*). Paul had, at the same time, regarded the Jewish pseudo-Messiah as the highest incarnation of this pseudo-prophecy (§ 63, *c*). The Second Epistle of Peter had also, in the appearance of the doctrines of false liberty, conjectured the approach of the pseudo-prophecy of the last times (§ 128, *d*, footnote 8). Our book, too, knows of a Satanic false prophecy (ii. 20, 24; comp. ver. 2), which seduces Christianity to heathenish libertinism. Hence also, if, even in the circle of visions, in which our prophet more especially moves, false prophecy is above all effectual on heathenish ground, yet these manifestations cannot on that account be considered excluded within Christianity, so far as it seduces believers to heathenish immorality, and likewise moves them thereby to pay homage to the worldly power.

interpretation of ἰστατεύθη, but evidently in the present of the seer), that he may rage against the Church of God (xiii. 5–7), while the final ruler of the world, who is identical with the beast (xvii. 11), as soon as the ten horns have given him their power (ver. 13), at once begins that last struggle with Messiah in which he perishes (ver. 14), and thus therewith the identification of the beast in chap. xiii. with the personal Antichrist becomes impossible. The Apocalypse knows as little of the 3½ years of this personal Antichrist as it does of 3½ decades to be distinguished from it, which Gebhardt, p. 285 [E. T. 271], reckons up. The reference of the numerical mystery, xiii. 18, to Nero, which seems to be opposed by the weightiest reasons, decides nothing on the main question, since in any case this so mysteriously significant name cannot be simply a personal name, but a designation of the essential characteristic; and thus even the Roman Empire, as such in its antichristian quality, may be henceforward designated by the name of the first persecutor of the Christians.

[3] At the bottom of this idea there lies, no doubt, the fact that Vespasian had obtained the imperial power by the help of heathen oracles and miracles, and also that the empire had been restored by the power of heathen jugglery; but it cannot possibly refer to the mere existence of "mathematicians and others such like round about Nero" (Hilgenfeld, p. 429). How the image, which the false prophet is said to make for the beast (xiii. 14), or the worship of it (ver. 15), is to point to Nero personally, is not to be understood, since the beast in reality is ever present only in a single bearer of imperial power who may be represented; but the image to which divine honours are given, naturally does not represent him so much in his person, as rather in his imperial dignity, i.e. as the holder of imperial power. But that, to the author of the Apocalypse, there was but a very small distinction between the honour given to the new emperor, and the blasphemous apotheosis of him, Hilgenfeld, p. 428, himself admits.

(*c*) When it is said that the beast was, and is not, and will come again from the abyss, in order to go to destruction (xvii. 8), this can only indicate that the beast in his present form, *i.e.* the Roman Empire under the mild rule of its ruler Vespasian, has no longer the former antichristian quality which it once bore under the rule of the persecutor of the Christians, Nero, but it will assume that power once again in greatest energy, and will then at once go to destruction.[4] With this is connected, quite in the way of the Jewish apocalyptic system, the combination of the author, by which he seeks to interpret the impending development of the worldly power, hostile to God in its yet remaining elements. The number of the heads of the beast is given him by Daniel as seven (note *a*); the coincidence of these with the number of the seven hills on which the woman, *i.e.* the worldly metropolis, was enthroned (xvii. 3, 7; comp. ver. 9), is altogether a token to the author that for the beast which bears the woman (xvii. 3), *i.e.* or the Roman Empire, a series of seven rulers is appointed. According to ver. 10, five of these heads, *i.e.* the first five Caesars from the old dynasty of Caesars, have now already fallen. Since the Caesar of the interregnum, during which the beast suffered its deadly wound (note *a*), is not naturally included, the sixth is, the presently reigning Vespasian. His son Titus follows him as the seventh, since with

[4] To the return of Nero, who evidently appears as one of the heads, xvii. 10, and is dead, this enigmatic word cannot be at all referred, since the beast, even during the time he is not (*i.e.* during the time his antichristian quality was not shown), is seen by the inhabitants of the earth (ver. 8 : βλεπόντων τ. ἐπ.), is even wondered at and worshipped (xiii. 3, 4), and must therefore be. The coming up of the beast from the abyss, on the other hand, naturally refers to the future (ver. 8 : παρέσται); for the author of the Apocalypse clearly distinguishes between the beast, in so far as it comes up out of the sea in his presence (xiii. 1), in order, after the healing of the deadly wound, to bring about the time of tribulation to the whole Church, and that which comes up out of the abyss (not out of Hades, as the dead Nero would) at the conclusion of the three and a half years (xi. 7, xvii. 8), *i.e.* the beast personified by the daemonic power in the last world-ruler, but which then goes away at once into destruction (comp. footnote 2). That an identity is explicitly expressed of this last emperor, *and of him only* (xvii. 11), with the beast, does not justify an identification of the beast with any other emperor, but forbids it (comp. footnote 1). It similarly decides against the identification of the beast in ver. 8 with one of the heads, that the beast, which carries the whore, *i.e.* makes Rome the world empire (xvii. 3, 7), can be only the empire as such, and not Nero risen again, who rather destroyed Rome (ver. 16).

Vespasian there has appeared a new imperial house; but Titus, as the end is at hand, can reign but a short time. If there is then an eighth, according to Dan. vii. 27, to come, then the last personification of the beast can only be he, in whom its antichristian qualification comes quite again to manifestation; and the bearer of this development which makes the empire ripe for judgment, and thus directly brings about the end, the author sees already, in the second descendant of the new imperial house, in Domitian (ver. 11).[5] Just in this, that all the historical figures, which lie in the circle of the visions of the author of the Apocalypse find their application in the course of the development indicated in the prophecy, he sees the security for this, that with the highest realization of the antichristian principle in the third of the Flavians the end will come.

(*d*) As once the fall of Jerusalem was to be the signal for the final catastrophe (§ 33, *b*), so now, when the former stands at the beginning of the time of the last tribulation, it is the fall of the world's metropolis.[6] The way in which the prophet

[5] The reference to Nero, which, besides, makes the motive for this apocalyptic combination quite perplexing, is here also excluded, for this reason, that the eighth is not designated as one of the seven, but as descended from the seven (that is to say, from Vespasian), in which there is for the author implied no genealogical notice (only in which case it would be to require, with Hilgenfeld, p. 433, ἐκ τοῦ ἑπτοῦ); but the indication of this, that that eighth, who will be the incarnation of antichristianity, stands already in his circle of visions as a descendant of the new imperial house. A reminiscence of this correct reference of the Apocalypse is preserved in the singular error of Irenaeus, by which it is to be written *under* (instead of with reference to) Domitian. I will not contend with Hilgenfeld, p. 432, on this point, whether the author of the Apocalypse could ascribe rather to Otho and Vitellius than to Titus a short reign, since, finally, the shortness of the reign ascribed to the seventh Caesar is ever required from the nearness of the end generally. But why it should be "a mad expectation," that Domitian will overthrow the empire of his father and brother by the governors of the provinces, it being presupposed that he, as the author of the Apocalypse regards it, comes forth equipped as the the most perfect organ of Satanic might, and therefore with its powers, I cannot conceive. Hilgenfeld seeks to show that the year 68 offered for the combination of the author of the Apocalypse a very favourable political constellation; but he forgets that whoever counts with such factors as that of Nero returning from the kingdom of the dead, has no longer any right to boast of historical probabilities.

[6] As Jerusalem, by the slaying of the Lord (xi. 8), so has Rome (xvii. 18; comp. vv. 5, 9), by the slaying of the two witnesses (xvii. 6, xviii. 20, xix. 2), by seducing all nations to the sin of fornication (§ 117, *b*), and to worship the worldly power (xvii. 2, xviii. 3), which, moreover, is itself represented (xiv.) as

imagines himself entering on that catastrophe is clear from chap. xvii., where the city is shown to the seer as already devastated (ἐν ἐρήμῳ: vv. 1–6). Domitian, that is to say, will obtain the empire, not in consequence of natural succession, but, as happened once in the period of the interregnum, during the reign of the seventh Caesar, a revolution will break out simultaneously in all the provinces of the Roman Empire. The rulers symbolized by the horns (xiii. 1, xvii. 3) will become independent (ver. 12); but then, having become unanimous by a sort of miracle, they still call the last Flavian to become emperor (ver. 13), and coming to Rome will destroy the capital with fire, as it would keep firm to the seventh emperor (vv. 16, 17; comp. xviii. 8). But with the fall of Rome there by no means fell the antichristian empire. Rather the last emperor, in whom the whole daemonic nature of the beast is, as it were, incarnated in league with his ten royal helpers, renews at once the struggle with the Christ and His believing people (xvii. 14), as he also fights with the two prophets of Israel, and kills them (xi. 7).[7] Against them Messiah already, vi. 2, going forth to victory (xix. 11–13, xv. 16), comes with His heavenly hosts (ver. 14). Thus the judgment of the great day of the Lord appears (xvi. 14: ἡ ἡμέρα ἐκείνη ἡ μεγάλη τοῦ Θεοῦ; comp. § 33, *c*; 40, *d*; 129, *a*), according to the typical analogy of God's judgments, which once took place in Jehovah's victories over the Gentiles gathered together against His people to battle, under

a divine judgment (comp. § 70, *d*), and by numberless other sins (xviii. 5–7), wrought out her destruction; and the blood of all the slaughtered holy ones is now to come upon her head, as once it came upon Jerusalem and her heads (xviii. 24; comp. Matt. xxiii. 35). The nearer this judgment of God stands (xviii. 8, 20), the more pressingly are Christians urged to flee from Rome (xviii. 4), as formerly out of Jerusalem (Matt. xxiv. 16). Even, xiv. 8, the fall of Rome appears as the beginning of the end; xvi. 19–21, it is expressly represented in symbolical imagery (comp. xviii. 21–24) as the last of the preliminary judgments (§ 130, *b*).

[7] This last fight is already prepared in this way, that, in the judgment of the sixth bowl, three daemonic spirits, which proceed from Satan and the two beasts, have seduced the kings of the earth outside the Roman Empire to gather together for the decisive battle of this day, while the way to the great slaughter-field is prepared for them by the drying up of the Euphrates (xvi. 12–16). These kings of the East have been often quite wrongly identified with the ten governors; they rather appear, xix. 19, along with their armies, to be in league with the beast, to which, indeed, the ten horns notwithstanding belong for the last fight.

the image of a great slaughter, before the beginning of which an angel summons the birds to a great feast of dead bodies (xix. 17, 18), and to a dreadful bath in blood, in which all the followers of the beast fall (ver. 21; comp. xiv. 20).[8] The power of the Roman Empire is thereby for ever annihilated, and the two beasts are cast into the lake of fire (ver. 20).

§ 132. *The Earthly and the Heavenly Consummation.*

Now begins the perfected kingdom of Christ on the earth, in which He rules along with His true servants and the martyrs raised from the dead; a kingdom, however, which as earthly has but a limited continuance, because Satan, fettered for a long time, breaks out finally once more against it, in order to be then destroyed for ever (*a*). Then only on the overthrow of the world comes the final judgment, for which all the dead are raised, either to receive eternal life, or to be delivered up to the second death (*b*). The perfected kingdom of God comes, in the new world, with the appearance of the new Jerusalem, with the taking of the Church home by Messiah (*c*). Then the perfect live for ever in spotless holiness, in divine glory and blessedness; they behold the face of God, who makes His dwelling among them (*d*).

(*a*) It is implied in the historical situation of the Apocalypse that the judgment, which the returning Christ brings, is confined to the worldly power and its associates, because enmity to God and antichristianity had been concentrated and personified in these two organs of Satan. But the mightier and the more terrible they thereby became in the present, the weaker must they become as soon as ever their organs are destroyed; and with this once more is connected the hope of an earthly realization of the kingdom of God, to be brought about by Messiah. With the overthrow of the worldly power

[8] The judgment, which God executed by His Messiah, appears under other symbolical figures, when the latter reaps the great harvest with the sharp sickle (xiv. 14–16) or treads the winepress of the wrath of God (vv. 17–20; comp. xix. 15). This judgment, to be sure, is in view, vi. 10, when vengeance for the innocent blood shed is referred to. On the other hand, vi. 17, by the day of the great wrath, the real last judgment is thought of (xx. 11 ff., and therewith § 132, *b*), although there mention is expressly made of the wrath of the Lamb (vi. 16; comp. also xi. 18, and therewith Gebhardt, p. 300 [E. T. 285]).

is Satan's power broken; he is bound and shut up in the abyss (xx. 1–3). But in that way is room made for the rule of Christ on the earth; and since the promise has been made to His true disciples, that they shall rule with Him (iii. 21, ii. 26, v. 10; comp. § 97, *d*), it must be now decided who have proved themselves true, and those of them who have died, whether as martyrs or by a natural death, must be raised. And thus before the earthly consummation there is a judgment and a first resurrection (xx. 4–6).[1] Connected with the Jewish idea of a thousand years' continuance of the (earthly) Messianic kingdom is now the earthly consummation, which, as such, can naturally have but a limited duration, fixed for a thousand years, only that this number may have possibly another signification, as all the numbers according to the plan of the Apocalypse.[2] In this kingdom of Christ for a thousand years is now fulfilled the promised completion of the Old Testament theocracy, in which, not the literal Israel, to be sure, but the true Israel (§ 130, *c*), has reached the goal proposed to itself

[1] It is the sifting of believers promised at Christ's second coming (§ 33, *c*) which is here described with the colours of Dan. vii. 9. It is hence quite inadmissible to substitute, with Gebhardt, p. 292 [E. T. 278], ruling for judging. It no doubt remains indeterminate from the words who is to hold the judgment; but since the martyrs are found approved as such, it seems ever to be most natural to regard them as those who determine which of the other Christians, who have in the meantime died, as also which of the survivors, has like them been found approved. Then, also, in the relative clause not only are meant those who have died with a true testimony (comp. second edition, and Gebhardt, p. 294 [E. T. 280]), but along with them survivors, and hence also ἔζησαν, with its double meaning, follows. But the change of the survivors is not by any means to be considered included in the first resurrection (Gebhardt, p. 295 [E. T. 281]), since the consummation is an earthly one, and the resurrection to it can restore but to an earthly life (comp. Heb. xi. 35). Gess, p. 584, appears to transport the risen to Christ in heaven.

[2] It is, moreover, by no means clear that Christ coming again will Himself dwell on the earth; conformably to the prophecy (Ps. cx. 1), after He has made at His return all His enemies His footstool, He rules on the earth through His believing people. In an earlier vision, after Israel's conversion (xi. 13), at the conclusion of the time of the great tribulation (ver. 2; comp. with xiii. 5), the everlasting kingdom of God and His Anointed is immediately introduced (xi. 15; comp. § 103, *b*). Here, just as in the earlier Pauline Epistles (§ 99, *c*), the kingdom of Messiah is distinguished from the perfected kingdom of God (xix. 6); only that with Paul immediately on the subjugation of all enemies there follows the giving up of the kingdom to the Father, while here the rule of Christ is perfected in the earthly present, and has a definite period of continuance.

as its ideal, and has become a royal priesthood (xx. 6; comp. 1 Pet. ii. 9, and therewith § 45, *c*), whose ideal centre is yet ever the beloved city (Jerusalem) (ver. 9). And as, according to the ancient prophetic idea, only at the time of the consummation of Israel's theocracy, the Gentile nations throughout, attracted by the contemplation of the salvation realized in Israel, will connect themselves with Israel (comp. § 43, *a*); so the nations of the earth still continue, so far as they have not fought in the army of the worldly power against believers, the object for the priestly and kingly activity of believers (ver. 6; comp. v. 10), by whom salvation is brought to them. Only the contemplation of the perfected salvation will lead them to repentance. Likewise, indeed, the most distant of those nations (Gog and Magog), who are the least affected by this influence, continue to be the subjects of seduction, when Satan has been unbound after the thousand years (xx. 7, 8). Their last assault on the kingdom of Christ, as it is looked at on the ground of prophetic imagery (comp. Ezek. xxxviii. 8–16), is defeated by the direct interposition of God; fire falls from heaven (comp. Ezek. xxxix. 6) and devours them (ver. 9); their leader is now delivered up to everlasting destruction, ver. 10.

(*b*) By the hope of an earthly consummation which here again emerges, is the idea of a great day of the Lord split into its different parts. The judgment of this day, as it results at the second coming of Christ, has brought victory only to the kingdom of God on earth. But the universal judgment, as the definite decision on the fate of all men, as it is likewise thought of as connected with the day of the Lord (comp. § 131, *d*, footnote 8), is now introduced only at the end of the thousand years' kingdom, and doubtless, as § 126, *b*, 129, *b*, in immediate connection with that destruction of the world (xx. 11; comp. xxi. 1), which in the first place carries aloft all those who survive, as well as those members of the thousand years' kingdom who have been raised again for the earthly kingdom. Hence there arises the idea of a second resurrection, as, to be sure, it is only indirectly, xx. 5, 6, hinted at, and this a general one; for all the dead must stand before God's judgment-seat (vv. 12, 13). Naturally those only who attain to the final heavenly consummation experience a resurrection in the proper sense (*i.e.* a quickening in a heavenly

body), as § 99, *b*, 126, *d*, footnote 7; the others only appear at God's judgment-seat in order to be handed over to death and Hades, ver. 14, as it were to a potentialized death (ὁ δεύτερος θάνατος: ver. 15; comp. ii. 11, xx. 6). But this is described as a portion in the lake of fire (xxi. 8; comp. xx. 14), which burns with brimstone (xix. 20), and brings with it an endless misery (xiv. 10, 11; comp. xix. 3, xx. 10), by which image (borrowed from Gen. xix. 24) is to be designated not in any way an eternal annihilation (as § 126, *b*), but a miserable exclusion from blessedness (xxi. 27, xxii. 3, 15), in which is found the unblessedness of an abiding state of death (§ 34, *d*). With this is introduced definite retribution, which decides men's fate according to their works, which stand recorded in the books of the heavenly Judge (xx. 12, 13; comp. 1 Pet. i. 17; 2 Cor. v. 10).[3]

(*c*) The scene of the final consummation is the new world, which God calls into being on the destruction of the old world (xxi. 1, 5; comp. § 129, *d*). As in the Epistle to the Hebrews (§ 126, *d*), the perfected kingdom of God appears (i. 9) as the holy city (xxii. 19; comp. iii. 12: ἡ πόλις τοῦ Θεοῦ), the new Jerusalem (xxi. 2, 10); and if the seer beholds it come down from heaven, it is implied in this only, that ideally the final consummation is already prepared with God, long before it is realized at the end of the times (§ 117, *d*). Therewith also is the Church of the last times of consumma-

[3] This retribution is also sometimes directly connected with the second coming of Christ (ii. 23, xxii. 12), because the earthly and heavenly consummation are not regarded as separated, or, as Matt. x. 32, Christ is named as He who announces the names of those before God's judgment throne (xx. 11) who are worthy of the reward (iii. 5). His works must always follow the dying one in order to go with him before the judgment-seat, and work out his justification (xiv. 13); as justification here self-evidently, as with James (§ 53, *c*), results on the ground of actual fact. Here also, as generally, this retribution is represented as an equivalent (comp. § 32, *b*). The true servants receive the corresponding reward (xi. 18, xxii. 12), as even the preservation from the last plagues is traced back to this, that they had kept the word of Christ (iii. 10). Destruction, on the other hand, overtakes the destroyers (xi. 18), as even in the preliminary judgments of God it is measured according to this standard (xiii. 10, xvi. 6), only that the measure of punishment may be even double the amount of sin (xviii. 6), and that for sinful indulgence the corresponding measure of torment is allotted (ver. 7). There is nevertheless even in this judgment in the end only an either—or (§ 32, *c*, *d*). One either obtains eternal life or eternal destruction (xvii. 8, 11).

tion designated as the ideal Jerusalem. This point of view rules the whole picture of that city of God, on whose doors stand the names of the twelve patriarchs (xxi. 12), as those of the twelve apostles stand upon its foundation-stones (ver. 14), and whose measure is reckoned according to twelve times a thousand and twelve times twelve (vv. 16, 17).[4] But the believing Israel are not its only citizens, but the Gentiles also walk in its light (xxi. 24), and their glory, as also that of their kings, must minister to the perfected kingdom of God (vv. 24, 26). They are there healed from the deadly sickness of hopelessness in which they once walked (xxii. 2), while believing Israel there beholds what it has always believed.[5] The Church, which bears the name of the New Jerusalem (iii. 12), is now the bride of Messiah (xxi. 9), with whom, at the final consummation, He celebrates His marriage, *i.e.* His perfect union (xix. 7; comp. § 105, *a*, footnote 2), at which the great marriage-feast is not awanting (ver. 9). It is very noteworthy that in the earthly completion of the kingdom of Christ this highest union does not take place.

(*d*) The contrast to the δεύτερος θάνατος, the blessedness of the perfected, consists, in the first place, of life in the emphatic sense (ζωή simply, as § 40, *d*; 50, *c*), for which they

[4] That here, too, any restoration of the Jewish state is not thought of, xxi. 22 shows, according to which the city needs no temple. But here also (as note *a*) the whole Church consists of God's servants, who serve God as priests (λατρεύειν: vii. 15, xxii. 3; comp. § 123, *d*), and wear His name (xxii. 4); these are what Israel should have been, but never was, in the fullest sense, His own people and His Son (xxi. 3, 7). The perfected Church sings the song of Moses and the Messiah (xv. 3); for the Old Testament and the New Testament salvation of the people of God is, in its essence, one, only the latter is the completion of the former.

[5] It does not follow from this that the Gentiles, even at the time of the consummation, are only Christians of an inferior grade (Baur, p. 212; Schenkel, pp. 104, 311), since, according to xxi. 27, even their names stand in the book of life, and they must therefore have the full right of citizenship in the city of God; and the distinction of christianized nations from the true Israel, consisting of converted individuals (Gebhardt, p. 317 f. [E. T. 300]), is a pure invention that does not in the least help, since, even according to Gebhardt, the nations are converted even in the thousand years' kingdom. Of any conversion of the Gentiles in the future world (comp. Messner, p. 375) there can be no idea after the general judgment and the commencement of *absolute* completeness; and since one must not, with Lechler, p. 205, change the idea of ἔθνη into that of nations connected with the city of God, so the participation of the Gentiles in the final consummation is only set forth in the colours of Old Testament prophecy (Isa. lx. 3, 11; Ps. lxxii. 10; comp. xv. 4, and even iii. 9).

stand recorded in the book of life (xxi. 27, after Dan. xii. 1), and which they receive at the same time with the acknowledgment of their spotless purity and holiness, since here, as generally (§ 65, *d*), life is the correlative of righteousness.[6] In virtue of this perfected holiness, the citizens of the heavenly Jerusalem live in the perfect fellowship of God. They behold God's face (xxii. 4; comp. § 34, *b*; 99, *b*; 126, *d*). God Himself dwells in their midst (xxi. 3, vii. 15, xxii. 3); the city needs no temple, because God and His Messiah dwell directly amongst its citizens (xxi. 22), because the whole city is His temple (vii. 15), in which individuals exist as pillars (iii. 12). There is therefore no longer any opposition to be thought of in the new world between heaven and earth, as in the present world. If, finally, over all there is ascribed to the heavenly consummation a participation in the divine glory (§ 50, *c*; 126, *d*), then this latter is represented under the image of the morning star (ii. 28), and of the royal dignity (xxii. 5), which the perfected receive. The whole heavenly Jerusalem has God's δόξα (xxi. 11), which is represented so, that the whole city consists of gold and precious stones and pearls (vv. 18–21). The city needs no sun and no moon, no lamps and no light, because in the splendour of the divine glory there is eternal day there (xxi. 23, 25, xxii. 5). In the possession of this glory they enjoy untroubled blessedness, because no sorrow and no want can ever disturb them more (xxi. 4, vii. 16, 17).[7]

[6] Participation in the ζωή is figuratively represented by the tree of life, which grows in the New Jerusalem (xxii. 2, xiv. 19) as it once grew in Paradise (ii. 7; comp. Gen. ii. 9); by the water of life, which there flows in streams from the throne of God and of the Messiah (xxii. 1; comp. xxi. 6, xxii. 17), and to whose streams Messiah as their Shepherd leads them (vii. 17); by the hidden manna (ii. 17), which imparts the powers of the eternal life; by the crown of life (iii. 11, ii. 10; comp. § 57, *d*), which they as conquerors (vi. 2) carry off. Their holiness, on the other hand, is represented by the white garments with which the perfected are clothed (comp. xix. 8), because they have not defiled their garments on the earth, and are worthy of this acknowledgment (iii. 4, 5, iv. 4), or because they have come out of the battle of life conquerors (vi. 11, vii. 9), as also by the white stone, which designates them by the name known to them alone, as the perfectly righteous (ii. 17). All these images belong to the plain representation of the final consummation in the vision, without its being regarded on that account as in any way sensuous (comp. Baur, p. 209), as elsewhere in the New Testament.

[7] In view of this consummation the true Christians are said to be blessed (i. 3,

CHAPTER VII.

THE CONFLICT OF THE PRESENT.

§ 133. *God and His Enemy.*

In the archetypal holy place of heaven is Jehovah enthroned the ever living, the holy and the Almighty, the just and the glorious, surrounded by the representatives of creation and redemption (*a*). In a broader sense the innumerable multitude of angels belong to this archetypal Church of God, who are the servants of God in nature, and instruments of His revelation (*b*). As God's enemy, Satan appears, who first seduced a portion of the angels, and since as a seducer has ruled the whole world, but by the exaltation of Messiah he has been in principle conquered (*c*). Henceforward he contends with the Church of God, partly by persecution and partly by seduction, till the world-historical struggle between God and Satan ends with his complete destruction (*d*).

(*a*) As in the Epistle to the Hebrews (§ 120, *a*), so here also heaven is God's dwelling-place (xiii. 6), or in it is the archetypal holy place (xiv. 17, xv. 5), with its altar of burnt-offerings (vi. 9, xiv. 18) and altar of incense (viii. 3, ix. 13), with its holiest and the ark therein (xi. 19), in which the unapproachable glory of God at times appears (xv. 8), as it did once in the tabernacle (Lev. xvi. 2). According to a somewhat different idea, God's throne stands in heaven (iv. 2). He who sits upon the throne is designated Jehovah over all, whose name is rewritten in many ways (ὁ ὢν καὶ ὁ ἦν καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος: i. 8, iv. 8; comp. xi. 17, xvi. 5; τὸ ἄλφα καὶ τὸ ὦ, ἡ ἀρχὴ καὶ τὸ τέλος: xxi. 6; comp. i. 8), the living God (vii. 2), ordinarily as the eternally living One (ὁ ζῶν εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων: iv. 9, 10, x. 6, xv. 7). Like Isa. vi. 3,

xiv. 13, xvi. 15, xix. 9, xxii. 7, 14; comp. xx. 6). All this blessedness is given to the conqueror as his abiding possession (xxi. 7: κληρονομεῖν; comp. § 34, *a*; 50, *c*; 126, *a*, footnote 1), which, since the Christian is in this connection designated as God's Son, may be also considered as his inheritance (§ 97, *c*; 124, *a*).

to Him, the thrice holy One, praise is offered (iv. 8; comp. vi. 10: *ὁ δεσπότης, ὁ ἅγιος καὶ ὁ ἀληθινός*), and similarly He is called the All-holy (*μόνος ὅσιος*), as He who shows Himself in all His righteous judgments (xvi. 5, 7) and His righteous acts (xv. 3, 4).[1] The predicate *κύριος ὁ Θεὸς ὁ παντοκράτωρ* designates His omnipotence (iv. 8, xi. 17, xv. 3, xvi. 7, xix. 6, xxi. 22; comp. *κύριος ἡμῶν*: iv. 11, xi. 15; *ὁ Θεὸς ὁ παντοκράτωρ*: i. 8, xvi. 14, xix. 15); His glory is symbolized by the glorious description of His throne (iv. 3), and celebrated in the ever-recurring doxologies (iv. 11, v. 13, vii. 12, xix. 1). After the manner of the New Testament, God is repeatedly praised as the Creator (iv. 11, x. 6, xiv. 7, xv. 3), as it is He who new created the old world (xxi. 5, xx. 11). All creation brings to Him its song of praise (v. 13), and the four living creatures, which, as creation's representatives, stand about the throne (iv. 6, v. 6, 11, vii. 11), and are at all times ready for His praise or His service (iv. 6–8), say to it Amen (v. 14, xix. 4), or they sing to Him their own song of praise (iv. 9). In them creation itself forms the first circle of the archetypal Church of God who stand gathered about His throne. But higher than the work of creation stands the work of salvation, which Israel experienced, and the Church of believers have experienced (xv. 3), or the founding of the Church of God, in which salvation is realized. Its representatives are the twenty-four elders, who sit on twenty-four thrones about the throne of God (iv. 4, xi. 16), in the number of whom the unity of the Old and New Testament Church of God (§ 130, *c*), by the union of the number of the patriarchs, who form the original stock of

[1] It is quite contrary to the form of expression in the Apocalypse to distinguish in idea, with Hahn, p. 102, and Gebhardt, p. 28 [E. T. 26] (*ὅσιος* of reverence for His holy constitution of the world), between *ἅγιος* and *ὅσιος*. Both designate quite in the Old Testament sense (§ 45, *d*, footnote 6) God's elevation as removed from all creaturely uncleanness. Ritschl, ii. p. 118, is needlessly at pains here to turn away the reference of righteousness to the avenging of sin, which is as clear as day, xix. 2, 11. For even if *δικαιώματα* (xv. 4), as the wider idea, includes the recovery of the rights of the pious (xviii. 20), yet these are not regarded as "positive saving manifestations," but as righteous acts, in which God exercises righteous retribution to both sides. But the *ἀληθιναὶ ὁδοί* and *κρίσεις* (xv. 3, xvi. 7, xix. 2) are not such as correspond to His promises and threatenings (Gebhardt, p. 29 [E. T. 28]), but modes of action and judgments as they ought to be.

the former Church, with the number of the apostles, who form the original stock of the latter, is seen.[2]

(*b*) As in the Epistle to the Hebrews the myriads of angels dwell in the heavenly city of God (§ 120, *b*), so the innumerable hosts of angels here form (v. 11; comp. Dan. vii. 10) the outer circle (vii. 11) round the living creatures and the elders. As angels of God (iii. 5; comp. xxii. 6) they are called holy (ἅγιοι, xiv. 10; comp. § 64, *a*; 127, *d*, footnote 9), but they are fellow-servants with God's servants on the earth (xix. 10, xxii. 9), who worship God as their God (vii. 3, 12) on their faces (vii. 11).[3] They appear, as in the Epistle to the Hebrews, in the first place, as God's servants in nature, in which to each his own range appears to be allotted, as, xvi. 5, mention is made of an angel of the water.[4]

[2] They are mentioned at times before (iv. 4, vii. 11, xix. 4) and at times after the four living creatures (v. 6, 8, 11, xiv. 3). Their white robes and golden crowns (iv. 4) designate them as conquerors, who have not been stained with sin, but who cast down their crowns before God, who helped them to be victorious, and they fall down and worship Him (iv. 10, 11, v. 14, xi. 16, xix. 4). The fellowship in ruling, which was realized only during the thousand years' kingdom, and in the heavenly Jerusalem (§ 132, *a*, *d*), is represented as already completed in this second circle of the archetypal Church of God by their sitting on thrones. As in the Epistle to the Hebrews the earthly Church, and the spirits of the just of the Old Testament made perfect, surround God ideally even now in the heavenly city of God (xii. 23; comp. § 117, *d*), so here the twenty-four elders from both periods of the Church of God, form its ideal representatives, in whom it is regarded as eternally perfected before God, which must first be realized in time. With the twenty-four priestly orders (Gebhardt, p. 51 [E. T. 49]) their number has nothing to do.

[3] As with Paul (§ 104, *a*) and Peter (§ 50, *a*, footnote 2), there are here also grades among them. Thus, viii. 2, the seven angels of the throne are mentioned who stand directly before God's face (comp. Tob. xii. 15). However natural the identification of these with the seven spirits of God may appear, especially after v. 6, yet i. 4 forbids this utterly. Among them Michael appears, who with Daniel (x. 13, xii. 1) is Israel's guardian angel (comp. Jude 9), as the leader of the angel hosts (xii. 7). Elsewhere mention is made of strong angels (v. 2, x. 1, xviii. 21; comp. ver. 1), by which, doubtless, angels of a higher order are meant; especially are they represented with trains, x. 1, xviii. 1, which bring the divine glory to remembrance; other angels appear in priestly garments, xv. 6.

[4] If even the fire over which, xiv. 18, an angel has power is, in the first place, the symbol of the divine judgments, the view is borrowed from the idea of a fire-angel. Just so are the four winds, which the angels at the four corners of the earth restrain (vii. 1–3), symbols especially of the plagues which are to come upon the godless world (§ 130, *b*); but as these mostly proceed from activities of nature, it is therein implied that the angels are the instruments

But they are, at the same time, the instruments of the divine activity among men. As they present the prayers of the holy before God (viii. 3–5), so they bring about in many ways the divine revelations, while they show the visions to the prophet (xvii. 1) and explain them (xvii. 7), or effect the symbolical actions which represent the future (vii. 2, x. 2, 5, xviii. 25).[5] They also appear, xiv. 17–19, as those who help Christ to execute judgment, in that they gather together the objects of it. Analogous to the idea in Daniel of protecting angels of individual nations (comp. Dan. x. 13, 20), the seven churches, to which epistles in chap. ii., iii. are addressed, have finally their protecting angels, which in i. 10 are represented as stars.[6]

(*c*) To these angels Satan must once have belonged (xx. 2, ὁ διάβολος καὶ ὁ σατανᾶς), who, xii. 3, 13, appears as the fire-coloured angel (*i.e.*, according to 2 Kings iii. 22, LXX., the blood-coloured great dragon), or with allusion to Gen. iii. as the old serpent (vv. 9, 15, xx. 2); for he was also, as indeed indirectly follows from xii. 8 f., originally an inhabitant of heaven; and when it is said, ver. 4, that he drew a third part of the stars of heaven with his tail, and threw them upon the earth, this can only mean that he seduced a portion of the angels, who are also, i. 20, symbolized by stars, to fall away from God, so that they are now designated as his angels

to bring them about or to restrain them (comp. the seven angels with bowls, xv. 1).

[5] It appears so far, as with Zechariah (i. 9, 13, ii. 3), that a definite angel has this commission before others (i. 1, xxii. 6). It is he who is mostly meant when the heavenly voice, which speaks to the prophet (x. 4, 8, xii. 10, xiv. 13, xviii. 4, xxi. 3, 5), or the speaker himself (xix. 9, 10, xxi. 6), is not more exactly defined. But that this angel is the personification of the revealing activity of God or of Christ (Gebhardt, p. 41 [E. T. 40], is a modernizing of the idea.

[6] These, to be sure, are in the Epistles regarded and addressed as representatives of the Churches, so that they almost become ideal figures, about which one may doubt whether they are thought of as actually existing outside the Churches. But through this wavering of the idea between an actual family of God in heaven, and an ideal representation of the earthly Church of God, it is only the more strongly expressed, that even the community of angels belong to the archetypal community of God in heaven, as the angels even yet have their place in the heavenly Jerusalem, *i.e.* in the perfected Church, as gate-watchers (xxi. 12). Gebhardt, p. 59 [E. T. 57], holds these angels to be personifications of the spirits of the Church, while Gess, p. 607 f., again makes them to be bishops.

(xii. 7, 9).[7] But as Satan as the old serpent seduced the first men, so does he seduce the whole earth (xii. 9; comp. xx. 8). His special sphere of dominion is heathenism, in which (xiii. 4) with his angels (ix. 20), according to the Jewish idea made known to us by Paul (comp. § 70, *c*), he is worshipped. As the ruler of the world, he appears, xii. 3, with seven crowned heads. He is therefore the old enemy of God, who hinders the realization of the kingdom of God on the earth. As now for the purpose of realizing this kingdom in the end, the Messiah had to be born, Satan proceeded at once to devour Him; but He was taken up to God, and thereby for ever delivered from his power (vv. 4, 5). As in the Gospels even Messiah appears as the conqueror of Satan (§ 23), so by His exaltation, which, however, was but the result of His voluntary death, has He obtained the victory over him (iii. 21, v. 5) and broken his power. The victory is won, and the kingdom of God and His Messiah secured already in principle by this (xii. 10), because in the exaltation of Messiah lies the security for the completion of the kingdom of God.[8]

(*d*) But his activity is by no means thereby destroyed. Rather just because he has been thrown on the earth, he has for a short time the power to let loose his wrath on men (xii. 9, 12).[9] He is, as with Peter (§ 46, *d*, footnote 6), the

[7] It is such a Satan-angel, who is the star fallen from heaven (ix. 1), who lets loose the plague of locusts from the abyss over the inhabitants of the earth, and is expressly designated, ver. 11, as the angel of the abyss, Abaddon or Apollyon. To these belong the four angels, who are bound on the Euphrates, and are, ix. 14, loosened in order to lead on the daemonic hosts of horsemen. The Satan-angels have here also, as with Paul (2 Cor. xii. 7), power to plague men so far as they are permitted by God, but thereby their peculiarity as Satan-angels is not taken away, as Gebhardt, p. 37 [E. T. 36], supposes.

[8] If the devil in this connection is designated as the accuser of men (comp. Job i. 2; Zech. iii.), there is implied in this the thought that by the removal of guilt, which gave him the right to accuse them, that right of the devil over men, and with it every power over them, was lost in principle by the death of Christ (comp. Col. ii. 15, and with it § 104, *b*; Heb. ii. 14, and with it § 122, *d*). This is so represented, xii. 7–9, that the angel hosts under their prince Michael have again contended with the devil and his angels, and have driven them from heaven (comp. ver. 10).

[9] The special dwelling-place henceforth appointed for him is, to be sure, the abyss (ἄβυσσος, comp. Luke viii. 31) whence come the hellish plagues (ix. 1, 2), and whence Satan's instruments come up (xi. 7, xvii. 8), wherein also he is shut, xx. 1–3. Yet has he power meanwhile from there to work on the earth. In

persecutor of the Christian Church (vv. 13–16); and hence unbelieving Jews, who persecute the Christians, are called Satan's synagogue (ii. 9), by them he has thrown the believers into prison (ver. 10), and where such persecution exists there has he his throne (ver. 13). But he works also by seduction; for the false prophets, who profess to have known the depths of God, have known in truth Satan's depths (ver. 24). In particular, however, he comes forth as the special enemy of the Church of God, while he equips the two beasts (§ 131) against her. To the first beast he has given his power (xiii. 2, 4), represented by the ten horns (xii. 3); to the second beast his power of working miracles, by which he misleads the inhabitants of the earth (xiii. 14).[10] Thus the great eschatological drama, which the apocalyptic image of the future sketches, appears as the last fight between the two highest powers, between God and Satan. Only after the fettering and the shutting up of Satan can the earthly kingdom of Messiah begin (xx. 1–3), and only after he has been made harmless after his being set free for the last time (vv. 7, 8), and he has been awarded his punishment (ver. 10), can the heavenly consummation come. There lies in this no Manichaean dualism, as Baur, p. 229, supposes, but only the deepest experience of the work of redemption as the definite destruction of the power from which all sin in the world of men proceeds. But He, by whom God conducts this fight against Satan to victory, is His Messiah.

§ 134. *The Messiah.*

The Messiah by His innocent and patient suffering cleansed men from the stains of guilt, and delivered them from the dominion of Satan (*a*). In consequence of His victory over death, He has been exalted to godlike dominion of the world (*b*). The divine glory of the Messiah is exhibited in the fiery glance of His divine omniscience, and in the symbols

particular, the wilderness is the haunt of demons and unclean spirits (xviii. 2; comp. § 23, *b*), on which account Satan's angels lie bound on the Euphrates, on the other side of the desert (ix. 14).

[10] Then, likewise, all the three unclean spirits (πνεύματα δαιμονίων), which come out from him and from the two beasts, by whom he stirs up the kings of the earth to the last conflict against Messiah (xvi. 13, 14).

of omnipresent energy in the world. He is worshipped and praised by all creatures (*c*). But He is also an archetypal Being (*uranfängliches Wesen*), who existed before all creatures (*d*).

(*a*) The author of the Apocalypse proceeds from the view of the earthly life of Jesus;[1] he derives His descent from Judah (v. 5; comp. Heb. vii. 14), but in order to qualify Him as the Messiah, with reference to Gen. xlix. 9; similarly His descent is from the family of David (§ 19, *a*), with reference to Isa. xi. 1, 10 (v. 5, xxii. 16). But, above all, it is characteristic that the standing form of view, under which Jesus here appears, is the image of a lamb (*ἀρνίον*: twenty-nine times), and, to be sure, as slain (v. 6, 12, xiii. 8; comp. vii. 14).[2] From this it is clear that His suffering and death is the foundation of His Messianic work, as He then also, like the Messianic High Priest of the Epistle to the Hebrews (§ 119), appears *à priori* in priestly garments (i. 13). If the Christians have washed their robes and made them clean in the blood of the Lamb (vii. 14, xxii. 14), the latter is regarded, as by Peter (§ 49, *c*; 127, *c*, footnote 7), and in the Epistle to the Hebrews (§ 123, *a*), as the means of purification, which

[1] Most commonly Christ is called by His historical personal name (Ἰησοῦς: i. 9, xii. 17, xiv. 12, xvii. 6, xix. 10, xx. 4, xxii. 16, 20, 21), as in the Epistle to the Hebrews (§ 118, *a*, footnote 1). Only in the superscription and address does Ἰησοῦς Χριστός occur, and in the account of the thousand years' kingdom, where, however, the appellative sense of the name comes out, ὁ Χριστός (xx. 4, 6). In the concluding blessing, ὁ κύριος Ἰησοῦς occurs (xxii. 21; comp. ver. 20: κύριε Ἰησοῦ); comp. xii. 5, where He appears as the child of the Old Testament theocracy.

[2] From the intentionally selected diminutive (comp. Schenkel, p. 304), it is clear that the Passover lamb is not thereby to be thought of, as Reuss, i. p. 477 [E. T. 413], supposes, but the Messiah, who, according to Isa. liii. 7, went quiet and patient as a lamb to the slaughter-house (comp. also Jer. xi. 19; § 38, *d*; 49, *a*). But this presupposes a lively view of His innocent and patient sufferings, as we found it, besides in Peter, only in the Epistle to the Hebrews (§ 119, *b*, footnote 5). Ritschl, ii. p. 181, finds here a combination of the Passover lamb with the covenant sacrifice (on account of vii. 14), and on account of v. 9 he even transfers the sacrificial act into heaven (p. 184 f.); Gebhardt, p. 120 [E. T. 114], admits at least a combination with Isa. liii., but (along with others) he holds fast especially to the type of the Passover lamb, by which he wishes mainly to explain the *ἀγοράζειν* (p. 122 [E. T. 116]). But even the high-priestly appearance of Christ, as the guilt-atoning efficacy of His blood (see above) presupposes a sacrifice, is yet nowhere in any definite way indicated as such. Biedermann, too, p. 235, admits the primary reference at least to Isa. liii.

removes from them the stains of the guilt of sin, but it has nothing to do with holiness (Gebhardt, p. 123). If this purification is at the same time designated as a loosening from sin (read λύσαντι), then the blood shed by Christ in His voluntary death from love to men (i. 5; comp. iii. 9), as in the teaching of Jesus (§ 22, *c*; comp. the ἀπολύτρωσις in Paul and in the Epistle to the Hebrews, § 80, *c*; 122, *c*), is presented as the ransom, for which men are delivered from the guilt into which sin brought them. But therewith, too, are they similarly at the same time ransomed, as by Peter (§ 49, *d*), from the bondage of Satan (comp. § 133, *c*, footnote 8), under which all the inhabitants of the earth stand (v. 9, xiv. 3), so that the ransomed now belong to God and the Lamb, as a first sheaf consecrated to God (xiv. 4), and form a kingdom in which they serve God as priests (i. 6).[3]

(*b*) In consequence of the victory, which He who rose again from the dead (i. 18, ii. 8) has obtained,[4] Christ has sitten down with the Father on His throne (iii. 21; comp. vii. 17, xii. 5), which is now the throne of God and of the Lamb (xxii. 1, 3); and He is thereby exalted to a position of divine lordship (§ 19, *c*), which cannot be awanting here as the chief point in the representation of Messiah. He is now God's Anointed, sharing with God the lordship over His kingdom (xi. 15, xii. 10); the Son of God (ii. 18), who calls Him His Father in an exclusive sense (i. 6, ii. 27, iii. 5, 21, xiv. 1); the Holy One, who is so in deed and in truth (iii. 7: ὁ ἅγιος ὁ ἀληθινός; comp. xix. 11: ὁ ἀληθινός), who has the

[3] Christ's victory over the devil, a victory which forms the basis for the rule of God on the earth (xii. 9, 10; comp. § 23, *c*), is no doubt perfected by His exaltation, but specially won by His death, on which account the conqueror, announced v. 5, appears, ver. 6, as a slain lamb. On account of His blood, which has redeemed them from the dominion of Satan, believers are now able to conquer Satan (xii. 11: ἐνίκησαν αὐτὸν διὰ τὸ αἷμα τοῦ ἀρνίου), who ever struggles afresh to win back his dominion over them (§ 133, *d*).

[4] In a strange way, Schenkel, p. 305, concludes from the fact that the resurrection is not expressly mentioned (although it appears to be already commemorated, according to i. 10, in the κυριακὴ ἡμέρα), that it is not regarded, as by Paul, as a mighty work of God. But that He is even called, i. 5, πρωτότοκος τῶν νεκρῶν (comp. Col. i. 18), shows clearly that He has been raised by God to an unchangeable life, not otherwise than all the dead. Only because He first broke through the unconquerable gates of Hades (comp. Matt. xvi. 18), has He henceforth the keys of death and Hades, *i.e.* is He able to deliver others from the power of death (i. 18).

key of David, and therefore complete power over the Messianic kingdom (iii. 7, after Isa. xxii. 22). As such He is the Lord of believers (xi. 8, xiv. 13, xxii. 20, 21), and they are His servants (i. 1, ii. 20), and bear His name (xiv. 1, iii. 12); He walks in the midst of the golden candlesticks, which represent the churches (i. 13, ii. 1), and has their stars in His hand (i. 16, 20, ii. 1). But, because He shares God's throne, He is at the same time the Lord simply, exalted above all kings and lords (i. 5, xvii. 14, xix. 16), and appears even in the royal attire of the diadem (xix. 12). With lordship He has received judgment over the Gentiles, according to Ps. ii. 8 (ii. 27, xii. 5, xix. 5); and hence He has a two-edged sword in His mouth (i. 16, ii. 12, 16, xix. 15), and feet of glowing brass (i. 15, ii. 18). Finally, as the Son of man of Daniel (§ 16, *d*), He will come again (i. 13, xiv. 14), in that He rises as the bright morning star, who ushers in the day of final consummation (xxii. 16; comp. 2 Pet. i. 19, and with it § 127, *b*).

(*c*) Although Jesus, according to ii. 27 (comp. v. 12), has received His Messianic lordship from God, as we found it set forth besides in the early apostolic system of teaching (§ 39, *c*; 50, *a*; 120, *d*), yet it is brought forward more prominently in the Apocalypse than elsewhere, that He has this position of divine dignity in virtue of His divine nature. The transference of the name of Jehovah is not indeed made to Him directly (§ 133, *a*), and that the new (iii. 12) unfathomable (xix. 12) name, which He receives, is the name of Jehovah (comp. Baur, p. 215), is unlikely. But the glory which He, according to the general New Testament teaching, receives, along with His exaltation, and which here appears under the image of the brightness of the sun (i. 16), is so much the really divine, that the prophet at its appearance falls down as dead (ver. 17), since no mortal can behold the glory of God. As God alone in the Old Testament tries the heart and the reins (Ps. vii. 10), so is this predicate ascribed to Christ (ii. 23; comp. 1 Cor. iv. 5), and this heart-searching glance is described in this way, that His eyes are like flames of fire (i. 14, ii. 18, xix. 12). He has the seven Spirits of God (iii. 1), by which the all-seeing, *i.e.* all-knowing, operates throughout the world; because by them, which, according to

Zech. iv. 10, are sent out through the whole earth, He appears as Himself everywhere present. The angels of God even are His angels (i. 1, xxii. 16, i. 16, 20; comp. § 19, *d*). The four living creatures and the twenty-four elders fall down before Him, as before God Himself (v. 8, 14); and this is here all the more significant, as προσκύνησις is declined by the angels as being a specific prerogative of God (xix. 10, xxii. 9). As they praise Him, not otherwise than God Himself (vii. 12, v. 12, 13), so the Apocalypse has doxologies to Christ (i. 6, vii. 10; comp. § 76, *b*; 127, *c*), and during the thousand years' kingdom priests minister to Him as to God Himself (xx. 6).

(*d*) Of the steps by which Paul and the Epistle to the Hebrews, by reasoning backwards, are led from the divine glory of Christ to His original divine nature (§ 79, 118), there is in the Apocalypse no trace. Yet the fact that Messiah is originally a Divine Being stands fast *à priori*. Even that He, i. 14, as the Ancient of Days (Dan. vii. 9), appears with white hair, points to His origin long before He appeared on the earth; but if He is designated, i. 17, ii. 8, as the first and the last, it refers equally to His eternity, as do the designations of God as the *A* and *Ω*, the beginning and the end, in the middle of which Christ is put (xxii. 13), as Gess, p. 572, rightly proves against Gebhardt, p. 85 [E. T. 81]. Finally, Christ is expressly, iii. 14, named as the ἀρχὴ τῆς κτίσεως τοῦ Θεοῦ. This expression does not, to be sure, designate Him as the principle of creation (Beyschlag, p. 131 f.), which here appears as the creation of God, but, according to Prov. viii. 22, as He who existed before the whole creation, so that He is not to be put on an equality with it, as Schenkel, p. 312, will have it (comp. Col. i. 15, and with it § 103, *a*, footnote 1).[5] The interpretation of

[5] For the explanation of the principle of creation (comp. Gess, p. 575), Gebhardt, p. 94 [E. T. 92], makes use of the meaning of the word as though κτίσις did not designate often enough the contents of creation (comp. Mark xvi. 15; Rom. i. 25, viii. 19, 22). Both of them (Gess, p. 587; Gebhardt, p. 101 [E. T. 99]) again apply quite wrongly the name, which Christ bears as He goes out to the last conflict (xix. 13: ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ), to His pre-temporal Being, as Beyschlag, p. 132, refers it to the Alexandrian doctrine of the Logos. The latter, however, does not designate Him as the medium of divine revelation (Lechler, p. 200), but, in conformity with the function with which He bears the

these expressions as simply titles (Baur, p. 215), which are transferred only externally to Christ in so far as the great eschatological expectation is connected with Him (p. 218), is unimaginable to any consciousness of God that has sprung up out of the New Testament.[6]

§ 135. *The Saints.*

The saints are the God-fearing servants of God, who do the works proceeding from repentance, and fulfil the commands of God revealed by Christ (*a*). But the fundamental presupposition for this is faith in Christ as the Messiah, by keeping which, in obedience to His word, one can in patience and fidelity even to death alone secure the victory in the contest with Satan (*b*). Yet it is the grace of God and Christ alone which leads to salvation; but the definite impulse given by the calling is no irrevocable one (*c*). The chief means by which saints are prepared for the consummation of salvation is prophecy, with its consolation and its exhortation (*d*).

(*a*) The members of the New Testament Church of God are,

name, as the executor of the divine (judicial) will, inasmuch as, according to Old Testament views (Heb. iv. 12), the Word of God as living directly executes what it announces. Biedermann, p. 235, finds in this name, which he identifies with that in iii. 12, Christ; as the actual revelation of the divine glory designates and means, that *He as such* is called also the realized ground and purpose of creation (iii. 14, xxii. 13), although this combination is nowhere indicated. Equally objectless is it with Gebhardt, p. 82 f. [E. T. 79], from ὅμοιος υἱῷ ἀνθρώπου to infer an originally Divine Being in human form; or with Gess, p. 576, from the name of Son to infer essential equality with God.

[6] That Christ has received His exaltation to the glory of divine power only by God (Biedermann, p. 235; Schenkel, p. 311) proves so little, that by the expressions regarding His original divine nature "it is not seriously meant," that these rather explain the mystery of the former. A contradiction with the glory of divine power given Him on the ground of His original divine nature appears only to lie in this, that the exalted Christ, ii. 7, iii. 2, 12, calls God His God; and this is to be explained only by the fact that, if the image of Him as He wandered on the earth lived in the memory of an eye-witness, it is naturally transferred by him to the Exalted One. But the conception of the pre-existence presupposed in our book as an ideal one, which yet the author of the Apocalypse himself is not to distinguish from a real one (Beyschlag, p. 137), cannot be based on this, that, if the theocracy gave birth to the Messiah (xii. 5), He must have been for a long time in it in embryo (p. 138). For that *this* former existence is no other than that given in prophecy, is just as evident as that it not only does not exclude the actual existence of the person of whom prophecy speaks, but rather very naturally presupposes that existence.

as all true Israelites (*e.g.* Moses, xv. 3, and the prophets, x. 7, xi. 18), servants of God (δοῦλοι Θεοῦ: vii. 3, xix. 2, 5, xxii. 3, 6), who fear His name (xi. 18; comp. xix. 5),[1] praise Him (xv. 4), and give to Him honour (xi. 13, xiv. 7, xvi. 9, xix. 7), as in Peter (§ 45, *c*); but as members of His own people (§ 130, *c*), who bear His name (xiv. 1, iii. 12), they are uniformly called in our book saints (οἱ ἅγιοι: v. 8, viii. 3, 4, and very often). Their righteous deeds (δικαιώματα, as xv. 4) form the marriage garments, in which they are one day introduced to perfect fellowship with Messiah (xix. 8); hence must they evermore practise righteousness and sanctify themselves (xxii. 11), in order that their works may be perfect in God's judgment (iii. 2: ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ).[2] But these works are by no means outward services. Only by the repentance (μετάνοια) required by Christ (§ 21) can those, who are not Christians, turn from their sinful works (ix. 20, 21, xvi. 11) and give honour to God (xvi. 9). Just as Christians, if they allow themselves to relax from moral efforts (ii. 5, iii. 3, 19), or to be seduced to immorality (ii. 16, 21, 22), can attain by repentance to works well-pleasing to God.[3] To do these works

[1] Since, xix. 5, according to the correct reading, οἱ φοβ. αὐτόν is in apposition to οἱ δοῦλοι αὐτοῦ, it is quite inadmissible, on the single passage xi. 18, which is plainly conditioned by Ps. cxv. 13, to found the idea, that Gentile Christians specially are designated by this name, recalling proselytism to mind, as Gebhardt, p. 165 [E. T. 157 f.], wishes.

[2] According to the symbolism of the Apocalypse, the moral walk of a man, as the outward exhibition of his piety, is his clothing, from which it evidently does not follow, that a high value is ascribed to works in themselves as separate from the subject (Baur, p. 226), but quite the contrary. The man is naked if he fails in a moral walk (iii. 18), and every one sees the nakedness of his piety (xvi. 15). He stains his garments by sin (iii. 4), which also, xxii. 11, appears as defilement in contrast to the holiness of Christians, and he purifies himself from the stains of guilt, which sin leaves on his garments, by the blood of Christ (vii. 14). It is a new turn of this symbolism, if the divine acknowledgment of human righteousness (§ 65, *c*) is set forth as a garment, which the righteous receive (xix. 8; comp. § 132, *d*, footnote 6).

[3] Among those works by which repentance is shown, is reckoned missionary zeal (iii. 8), as the service of love (ii. 4, 5, 19) to Christian brethren (i. 9, vi. 11, xix. 10, xxii. 9), who are at the same time brethren of God's heavenly family (§ 133, *b*, xii. 10). By these works the watchfulness already required by Christ (§ 30, *b*) is proved (iii. 2, xvi. 15), and the true life well-pleasing to God (iii. 1; comp. 2 Pet. i. 3); its want is an indication of lukewarmness and false conceit amid spiritual poverty (iii. 15–17). As in the Gospels (§ 29, *a*), the doing of such works can even be designated as the following of Christ, which consists of virginal purity from fleshly sins (which can be taken neither with Köstlin, p. 493, of virginity

is nothing else than to keep (τηρεῖν) the commandments of God (xii. 17, xiv. 12), which is identical with keeping the works of Christ (ii. 26), or of His word (iii. 8, 10), as the readers had received that word from others (iii. 3), or as they read it in this book (i. 3, xxii. 7, 9). There can by this be no thought, therefore, of the works of the Mosaic law, the indiscriminate fulfilment of which had besides become impossible with the fall of the temple, but only of the law proclaimed by Christ (comp. § 52, *a*). According to v. 8, viii. 3, 4, the prayers of the saints are the real sacrifice of incense, as they are themselves the real first sheaf (xiv. 4).[4]

(*b*) The fulfilment of the will of God made known by Christ presupposes, as § 52, *d*, faith in Jesus (xiv. 12), *i.e.* the confident persuasion that Jesus is the Messiah, and as such has made known God's will. And therefore the keeping of His word goes hand in hand with the confession of His name (iii. 8). Here also, therefore, is faith the fundamental condition for obtaining salvation; and that as such it is not

in the literal sense, nor with Gebhardt, p. 267 [E. T. 254], of moral spotlessness in a general sense) and in stainless truth (xiv. 4, 5), or as in hearing His voice, by which one lays oneself out for His activity (iii. 20).

[4] It follows then, doubtless, from this, that the author of the Apocalypse cannot have demanded from believers drawn from all nations (§ 130, *c*) acceptance of the law, if they would be incorporated into the true Israel. This he could do only if he set himself in sharpest opposition to the whole life, already quite freed from the law, of those Gentile-Christian churches of Lesser Asia (comp. § 105, *d*) to whom he wrote. But he now contends with a definite tendency among them (the Nicolaitans, ii. 6, 15), which is made known to us as the heathenizing libertinism made known to us by the Second Epistle of Peter (§ 128, *d*). This tendency would be spread by false apostles (ii. 2), and especially by a prophetess (ver. 20), who already supported it, as was there feared, on false doctrine giving itself out for a deeper wisdom (ver. 24; comp. § 131, *b*). To behold in this a Paulinism (comp. Baur, p. 244), which was no one single isolated tendency in Lesser Asia, but a universal one, is even on that account quite impossible, because essentially the matter here treated of is fornication and the eating of flesh offered in sacrifice to idols (ii. 14, 20). Just so had Paul opposed the former (§ 95, *a*); and the latter, although he looked upon it as in itself a thing indifferent (§ 93, *c*), yet had he forbidden in the most explicit terms, when it was connected with lax participation in heathen life dangerous to the soul, as in fellowship in idolatrous sacrificial feasts. The author of the Apocalypse stands on the ground of the apostolic council (§ 43, *c*), which entirely forbade such indulgence, no doubt, in the first place, for the sake of the synagogue, when with the early Church, as also the weak in the Pauline churches (§ 93, *c*), he might regard this indulgence as in itself dangerous; but he expressly says that Christ laid on the churches no other legal burden than beyond the points there required (ii. 24).

oftener enforced lies in this, that the exhortation of our book is dominated by the idea that the whole impending development is a conflict with Satan and his instruments against the Church (§ 133, *d*). Conformably with this, the chief task of the saints is to conquer in this conflict (ii. 7, 11, 17, iii. 5, 12, 21, xv. 2, xxi. 7); while, on the one hand, they keep the works of Christ in spite of temptation to sin (ii. 26), or hold fast to the former fulfilling His word (ii: 25, iii. 11); and while, on the other hand, they keep their faith in Christ in spite of the temptation to fall away (from faith) (xiv. 12), and do not deny (ii. 13) or hold fast His name (ii. 13), ever anew witness (xii. 11) and do not deny (iii. 8).[5] This twofold verification of faith is in the situation of our book the specific condition of the completion of salvation. But faith in particular is verified in patience (§ 30, *a*), if Satan's instruments threaten with persecution and death (xiii. 10, xiv. 12; comp. ii. 19) the true witnesses, who confess Jesus as the Messiah (xvii. 6; comp. ii. 13, xi. 3); since it is important patiently to bear what one has to suffer for Christ's name's sake (ii. 3), and not even to fear death[6] (ii. 10, xii. 11) for the sake of the witness of Jesus which one possesses (vi. 9, xx. 4). This patience is expressly reckoned as works (ii. 2, iii. 19), which the word of Jesus demands; nay, this word is essentially a word of patience (iii. 10), as Jesus Himself seems to be regarded as its pattern, i. 9.

(*c*) If humanity is delivered from the guilt of sin and the power of Satan by the voluntary death of Christ and His

[5] Inasmuch as faith in the Messiahship of Jesus includes, according to § 134, *b*, faith in His second coming, as the testimony of Jesus made in this book to the prophet proclaims it (xix. 10), this faith may be designated as the possession of the μαρτυρία Ἰησοῦ (xii. 17; comp. vi. 9); when that is lost, one at once begins to doubt its truth. On the ground entirely of considerations which prove nothing, Gebhardt, p. 158 f. [E. T. 150], following Baur, p. 224, wishes to translate πίστις throughout as "fidelity." The parallel to keep fast Jesus' name (ii. 13) can be only the not denying the faith, because even this latter is a faith in the Messiahship of Jesus, which one confesses by keeping fast His name of honour (§ 40, *c*). But in ii. 19 love stands opposed to its verification in διακονία, as faith to its verification in patience; and, just as here, from love, xiii. 10, from patience, xiv. 12, from keeping the commandments of God, one advances to faith, in which all these have their ultimate root.

[6] According to the connection of xiv. 13 with ver. 12, ἀποθνήσκειν ἐν κυρίῳ, as in the Epistles to the Thessalonians (§ 62, *c*, footnote 4), appears to designate quite generally dying in faith on the Lord.

exaltation by God (§ 134, *a*), then those who stand as conquerors before the throne of God must confess that they are indebted for the Messianic salvation (*σωτηρία*) to God, who has shown Himself gracious to them as *their* God (vii. 10, 12, iv. 11, xix. 6; comp. xxi. 3, 7; comp. § 83, *a*; 124, *a*), and to the Lamb (vii. 10; comp. ver. 14), so that their salvation is a work of God (xii. 10, xix. 1). Even the blessed martyrs know that they have become clean only in the blood of the Lamb (vii. 14). While the author appropriates the Pauline introductory and concluding blessings (§ 75, *d*), he acknowledges that grace and salvation come from God, from the seven spirits of God, and from Christ (i. 4, 5), and wishes for the readers the accompaniment of Christ's grace (xx. 21). It is Christ, who keeps them from the severest trials (iii. 10), who remedies their spiritual poverty of whatever sort it may be (ver. 18), who shows them the right way, and educates them if they need repentance (ver. 19), who goes with those who hear His voice and open to His activity, into the innermost personal fellowship (ver. 20). It cannot be more clearly expressed, that the obtaining of what is connected with salvation is entirely a work of Christ. Therefore, finally, eternal life also, which the Christian wins at the end (§ 132, *d*), is a gift of God, which is given quite freely (xxi. 6, xxii. 17). Nay, it seems as though this gift were given by an eternal divine predestination, since the recording in the book of life (xxi. 27) is the result even before the foundation of the world (xiii. 8, xvii. 8). But as the name of any one may again be blotted out of the book of life (iii. 5), and at the judgment examination is only made what names remain there (xx. 12, 15), that destination implies no irrevocable divine purpose ruling the individual, but only traces the election of Christians back to the eternal purpose of salvation.[7]

(*d*) To strengthen the saints in patience and fidelity, the word of prophecy is given them. While prophecy announces to them what is to happen to them in the near future, it

[7] If Christians are called *κλητοὶ καὶ ἐκλεκτοί* (xvii. 14), it follows even from the idea of calling (§ 128, *b*, footnote 3) that both ideas are to be understood as by Peter (§ 45, *b*, footnote 2), and xix. 9 shows that the calling is here also regarded as a destination to perfected salvation. Comp., on the other hand, the utterly futile objections of Gebhardt, p. 153 f. [E. T. 145 f.].

strengthens their conviction, that He whose coming is at hand is the Messiah, and comforts them under the sorrows of the present, while it puts the near end of these sufferings in view by the judgment over the enemies of God (x. 11). But while it hands over to the churches the requirements of Jesus, and adds promises to the faithful as well as threatenings to the apostate, it stirs up zeal to preserve faith in obedience to the word of Christ.[8] The ultimate source of prophecy can naturally be but God Himself. It is the secret of His purpose which He has revealed to the prophets His servants (ver. 7 : εὐηγγέλισεν); and the ever-fresh exhortation to repentance, with its background of promises, is called an everlasting gospel (xiv. 6). But God has given the revelation of future things to Christ, and from Him the prophecy of this book comes (i. 1).[9] And He can only show to the prophet what He has Himself seen; the opening of the book of the future is but the figurative representation of the truth, that the Messiah, who has completed the work of salvation, has Himself looked into the mystery of the divine purpose (i. 5, iii. 14; comp. xxii. 20). The contents, therefore, of revelation are called the testimony of Jesus (ἡ μαρτυρία Ἰησοῦ; i. 2, 9, xii. 17, xix. 10, xx. 4, and with it footnote 5; comp. vi. 9). But, according to the passage xix. 10, the testimony of Jesus, which the prophets have, is the spirit of prophecy, *i.e.* it is given them by the prophetic spirit. While the prophet testifies what Jesus gives him in vision to say to the churches (ii. 3), this spirit speaks to the churches (ii. 7, 11, 17, 29, iii. 6, 13, 22); and elsewhere also

[8] Hence the words of the prophecy of this book are to be heard (i. 3), and to be kept (xxii. 7, 9; comp. note *a*) in view of the nearness of the time, when it must be decided whether its promises to its readers are to be kept or not. The words of the prophet testify to the word of God (i. 2, 9; comp. vi. 9); they are even true and trustworthy words of God (xix. 9, xxi. 5, xxii. 6), which as such must be fulfilled (xvii. 17; comp. x. 7), and God threatens to punish all those who add to or take anything away from them (xxii. 18, 19).

[9] The slain Lamb, *i.e.* the Messiah, inasmuch as He, in consequence of His victory (v. 5), has become the instrument for the fulfilment of the divine promises, was alone worthy to loose the seals of the book of the future in which God's purposes stand recorded (ver. 9), and He has done this even in His eschatological prophecies (§ 33, *b*; comp. § 130, *b*), and He now reveals them to the prophet, His servant, in visions (i. 1), by which the latter witnesses to the churches what he saw (xxii. 16, i. 2), similarly to the two prophetic witnesses (xi. 3, 7).

when the prophet utters for the churches prophecy for exhortation and comfort, the spirit speaks *by* him (xiv. 13, xxii. 17), and not in any way as an independent being in contrast to Christ, as Gebhardt, p. 139 [E. T. 131], will have it. The prophet is ἐν πνεύματι; when he beholds the images of the future (i. 10, iv. 2, xvii. 3, xxi. 10), God Himself is called, xxii. 6, the God of the Spirit of the prophets; but here, to be sure, it is looked at but as the one spirit of prophecy in His manifold manifestations, as though these proceeded from Him, as, according to Zech. iii. 9, iv. 10, the one Spirit of God is looked at objectively in a sevenfold way in the seven spirits, which stand before the throne like burning torches (iv. 5), *i.e.* as organs of enlightenment and revelation.[10]

SECTION IV.

THE HISTORICAL BOOKS.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE MESSIAH OF THE JEWS AND THE SALVATION OF THE GENTILE WORLD.

§ 136. *The Jewish-Christian Gospels.*

The Gospel of Mark presents to us the Messiahship of Jesus, with evident reference to the very great difficulties felt

[10] If, i. 4, all grace and all salvation are derived along with God from His spirits (from which Gess, p. 569; Gebhardt, p. 139 [E. T. 131], conclude the personality of the Spirit), then it is clear from this activity of the Spirit in prophecy, an activity which helps the saints to fulfil the conditions for a perfect salvation, how this is meant. In v. 6, to be sure, the sevenfold Spirit of God, which Christ also has, iii. 1 (§ 134, *c*), is regarded as the divine Omniscience, that works throughout the world; but in the region of redemption He has His special significance as the medium of revelation, and He appears in men exclusively as the source of prophecy. On the other hand, for the assumption that He is here and elsewhere the source of supernatural life generally, and of Christian life in particular, there is no trace of proof adduced by Gebhardt, pp. 136, 142 [E. T. 129, 135], and also the introduction of an activity of the Spirit inwardly judging and

regarding it, arising from His self-manifestation in word, and work, and fate (*a*). The first Gospel, in a way more artistic and more learned, furnishes proof that Jesus is the Messiah promised by the prophets (*b*). If the first evangelist presents to us the conservative position of Jesus towards the law more strongly than Mark does, he yet by no means demands for it any abiding validity in the Jewish sense (*c*). And while even Mark, in the way he sets Jesus' sayings, seeks to make room for the acknowledgment of missions to the Gentiles, the first evangelist has shown explicitly how the salvation appointed for the Jews was taken from them, and given to the Gentiles on account of their sin (*d*).

(*a*) As even the oldest tradition regarding the Gospel of Mark (in Euseb. *Hist.* iii. 39) records that it owes its origin to the doctrinal statements of Peter, which, without doubt, were intended to ground and strengthen faith in the Messiahship of Jesus, the Gospel proclaims itself to be the glad tidings of Jesus Christ, the Son of God (i. 1), *i.e.* of the chosen one of the divine love, appointed to be the Messiah (comp. xiv. 61). It hence shows at the commencement how John prepared the way for Him by his baptism of repentance, and had even referred to the Coming One (i. 4–8), and then immediately it introduces Jesus Himself as anointed in baptism, witnessed to by God Himself as the Son of His love, and the Messiah proved in temptation by Satan (vv. 9–13).[1] Jesus begins His

punishing into iv. 5 is undertaken only by making it parallel with John xvi. 8 f. (p. 375 [E. T. 358]). The πνευματικῶς (xi. 8) indicates, to be sure, that the spirit of prophecy gives the city this name which designates it not according to its empirical name, but according to its nature,—a nature it has received through putting Messiah to death. This expression has nothing to do with the spiritual life of man. The νοῦς is rather the higher spiritual mind which enables one to understand the manifold mysteries of prophecy (xiii. 18, xvii. 9; comp. Luke xxiv. 45).

[1] While the oldest apostolic Gospel lingers by preference on the specialities of the temptation in the wilderness, Mark refers to the narrative known of it, how the Spirit, with which He was equipped for His Messianic calling, had immediately driven Him into the wilderness, and thus to the most needful preparation for it, and that after the temptation He had then been ministered to by angels, and that He therefore had been witnessed to by God Himself as the Son, proved in trial, in whom He was ever well pleased. Any putting Him parallel with the first Adam (Baur, p. 302) by a pictorial description of a solitary wilderness (i. 13: ἦν μετὰ τῶν θηρίων), in which God had to send His angels to minister to Him, is in no way indicated.

Messianic activity with the proclamation of the kingdom of God coming near with the fulness of times (vv. 14, 15), and He proves Himself, quite as in the sermon of Peter (Acts x. 38), by at once healing the sick, and especially by driving out devils, who knew and feared Him as the Messiah (i. 24, 34, iii. 11, 12, v. 7), the promised Bringer of salvation.[2] The more clearly He reveals His Messianic calling in the complete power to forgive sins (ii. 10), and in the introduction of a new Sabbath observance (ver. 28), as also in deeds of ever greater power, the more has He to complain of the want of understanding in many ways even on the part of the chosen twelve (iv. 13, vi. 52, vii. 18, viii. 17–21), until Peter in their name confesses Him as the Messiah (viii. 29). From that time Jesus begins, by an ever-repeated exhibition of the death appointed for Messiah (viii. 31, ix. 12, 31, x. 33, 34, 38), to prepare the disciples for His death, while He adds the prophecy of His resurrection, and at last explains the mystery of this death by a word about its saving significance (x. 45). At the same time the announcement of His second coming in glory begins (viii. 38), which in the transfiguration scene (ix. 2–8) receives its divine confirmation in the sense of 2 Pet. i. 16–18 (§ 127, *b*). He finally goes to Jerusalem (xi. 9, 10), is greeted even by the people as the Messiah (x. 47, 48), declares Himself in the presence of the hierarchy as the beloved Son of God (xii. 6), and announces to the disciples, in the detailed words which Mark has preserved, His coming again (chap. xiii.), a coming which is to finish what His earthly activity had left unfinished. With full plainness

[2] That our Gospel and not the Gospel of Luke, as Baur, p. 328, supposes, especially emphasizes the casting out of devils among all the other healing miracles of Jesus, I have already proven in the *Studien u. Kritiken* (1861, pp. 651, 653; comp. p. 709 f.). Moreover, the appearance of devils here in Jewish territory has naturally nothing to do with their dominion over the heathen world; but apart from the fact that these narratives presented to Mark in the peculiar circumstances and events of daemonic action the richest materials for pictorial description, he sees in them nothing else than Jesus Himself (§ 23, *c*) a victory secured over the enemy of God, by which a way was prepared for the kingdom of God on earth. Hence these instances of the expulsion of demons appear in Mark directly alongside of preaching, which is the second side of His Messianic activity (i. 39; comp. vi. 7) along with His teaching activity, by which He at once proves Himself to be the mighty One of God in contrast to the scribes (i. 22, 27); but soon enough He can communicate only to a narrower circle of receptive disciples the secret of the kingdom of God (iv. 11).

as to the nearness of His death (xiv. 8, 21), He goes with the disciples to the last supper, at which He institutes the new covenant (ver. 24), and He acknowledges before the judgment-seat His Messianic dignity (xv. 2) by an appeal to His exaltation and second coming (xiv. 62). At His death, the veil of the Holiest was rent (xv. 38), by which His Messianic work, in the sense of § 123, *d*, was finished, and by the loud triumphal cry with which He expired the heathen centurion himself acknowledged him to be the Son of God (ver. 39). The Gospel closes with the glad tidings of the resurrection, and of the immediate appearances of the Risen One (xvi. 6, 7), facts which open up the prospect of the fullest confirmation of His Messiahship in the sense of § 39, *a*. It is clear, therefore, from the Gospel of Mark, that during His earthly life Jesus had already showed Himself to be the Messiah both by word and deed; that everything, which occasioned the greatest hindrance to faith in Him (§ 38, *c*), He had shown to be *à priori* by divine appointment, and had explained its significance; that, finally, He had presupposed the Messianic exaltation perfected in His second coming; so this evidence is yet carried quite in an epic way by it through the whole objective representation of His life.[3]

[3] Only in the beginning of the Gospel there stands a reference to it, that the appearance of the forerunner already exactly corresponded with prophecy (i. 2, 3). In other respects it is shown simply from the words of Jesus, how He predicted what created the greatest stumbling-block to faith in Him. His sufferings, which must be like those of the Baptist (ix. 12, 13), His rejection by the hierarchy (xii. 10, 11), His apprehension (xiv. 49), nay, even His betrayal by one of the disciples (xiv. 21), and the scattering of all the others (xiv. 27), are already fully taken into account by prophecy (comp. however, iv. 12, vii. 6, 7). But it is, moreover, clear, that this first attempt to give a portrait of the life of Jesus is yet by no means dominated exclusively by the doctrinal tendency, and it is not to be explained by it, so that it is not to be looked at, as by Volkmar, as a didactic poem. The richly-coloured details of single events, the thoughtful descriptions of Christ's activity among the masses, the careful setting forth of the gradual increase in the opposition of the ruling class, as also the gradual separation between the receptive and the unreceptive among the people, above all, the thorough statement of the formation and the progressive education of the circle of the disciples, have almost nothing to do with any doctrinal tendency. The entire plan of the Gospel, arranged according to single principal points involved in the actual development of the history, plainly shows, that even if the doctrinal significance of this history was a motive for its composition, that significance is yet borne throughout by the living interest in the materials handed down as such.

(*b*) As our first Gospel is a development and more artistic setting forth of the picture of the life of Jesus presented to him in the second, then it has also pursued its doctrinal tendency more directly and in a more regardful way. It commences, therefore, to set forth Jesus, who from this Messianic dignity (ὁ Χριστός: ii. 4) has the surname of Χριστός (i. 16, xxvii. 17, 22; Ἰησοῦς Χριστός: i. 1, 18; comp. Mark i. 1), by means of the genealogy of His adoptive-father Joseph, and the story of his marriage, as the lawful heir of the royal house of David, in whom the whole divinely-appointed history of this house is to be closed (i. 17). Even in the history of the birth and childhood of this King of the Jews (ii. 2), a history which precedes our Gospel of the ἀρχὴ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου (Mark i. 1), the fulfilment of Messianic prophecy is shown throughout (i. 23, ii. 5, 6, 15, 17, 18, 23). Then, where Jesus Himself comes forward, as in Mark, as a preacher of the kingdom of heaven, and as a healer of the sick (iv. 23), there the fulfilment of prophecy is here pointed out both in His appearance as a teacher (iv. 14–16), of which chaps. v.–vii. give an example, and in His healing work, which chaps. viii. and ix. depict (viii. 17).[4] In the story of His sufferings the fulfilment of prophecy is pointed out in the Messianic entrance into Jerusalem (xxi. 4, 5, 16), in the fate of the betrayer (xxvii. 9, 10), and indirectly at least in the representation given of the crucifixion (xxvii. 34, 39–43). Finally, He appears in the farewell scene in Galilee as the exalted Messiah, who has received the Messianic government of the world (xxviii. 16–18). If the literary character of the author

[4] The ingenious application of the passage, Isa. liii. 4, to the healing miracles of Jesus, proves in the clearest way how little apostolic times found of direct prophecy of them in the Old Testament, on the ground of which they might have been as such invented, after the manner of Strauss. If His teaching and His works here encounter opposition from the ruling party, unreceptiveness from the people, then His conduct towards the former (xii. 17–21), as also towards the latter (xiii. 14, 15, xiii. 35), is presented as present in prophecy. More strongly than in the Gospel of Mark is His preaching throughout designated as the gospel of the kingdom (iv. 23, ix. 35, xxiv. 14; comp. especially the many parables of the kingdom of heaven), which qualifies Him to be the founder and the lawgiver of this kingdom, xvi. 18, 19 more particularly shows how Jesus had in view the actual realization of the kingdom of God in the ἐκκλησία, which was to be founded under the leadership of Peter, and how he had established the most important rules for it (xvii. 24–27, xviii. 15–20).

is shown even in the whole plan of the first Gospel, and in the way he carries through his doctrinal purpose, the same is also manifest by his knowledge of Hebrew names (i. 21, 23, ii. 23), as also by this, that, while in the Greek translation of the apostolic sources used by him, the Old Testament quotations put into the mouth of Jesus are in the form of the LXX. text (§ 74, *b*), the actual proofs of the fulfilment of Old Testament prophecy used by him, which he puts incidentally in the mouth of persons referred to in the same form (i. 22, xiii. 14), are given in the main from the original text (ii. 6, xiii. 14, 15, xxi. 5), and are often of such a kind that he could not have reached them from the LXX. (ii. 15, 23, viii. 17, xii. 18–21, xxvii. 9, 10).[5]

(*c*) If Mark, writing for Gentile Christians, did not use the explanation of Jesus about His relation in principle to the law, which the apostolic tradition possessed (comp. § 24, *a*), yet has he expressions enough, from which it follows that Jesus acknowledged the Old Testament law (i. 44, ii. 25, 26, vii. 9–13, x. 3–7, 19, xii. 29–31), as he then assumes as self-evident that Jesus will keep the Passover in the legal way (xiv. 12), and has kept it (ver. 26). Only that the apostolic source presupposes a strict following out of the Sabbath law by the followers of Jesus (Matt. xxiv. 20), he lets go with reference to his Gentile-Christian readers, who have been set free from the law (xiii. 18); and his interpretation of the words about the destroying of the temple (xv. 29), an interpretation he indicates in xiv. 58, plainly declares the Messianic Church in the sense of Peter (§ 45, *a*) as the new temple not made with hands. The first evangelist, who

[5] He is nevertheless acquainted with, and makes use of, the LXX. (ii. 18, iv. 15, 16, xii. 18-21, xxi. 16), nay, he would with difficulty have come at the quotation xiii. 35 (comp. xiii. 14, 15) without it. In other respects his method of quotation and interpretation is as free (xxvii. 9, 10, xiii. 35) and as regardless of the connection (ii. 15, 18, 23) as with Paul and in the Epistle to the Hebrews (§ 74, *b*, *c*; 116, *c*). As with Peter (§ 38, *b*; 49, *a*; comp. § 134, *a*, footnote 2), Jesus is the Servant of God, of Isaiah (viii. 17, xii. 18). Here too, in general, we see again Isaiah and the Psalms made use of most commonly (comp. § 74, *a*; 130, *c*, footnote 3), after these Zechariah and Jeremiah, Micah and Hosea once. The quotations are adduced as a word of the prophet (ii. 23, xiii. 35, xxi. 4; comp. ii. 5: γέγραπται διὰ τοῦ προφήτου), not seldom with the prophet's name (διὰ Ἡσαΐου: iv. 14, viii. 17, xii. 17, xiii. 14; comp. ii. 17, xxvii. 9), only i. 22, ii. 15 are brought forward as a word of God by the prophet (comp. § 116, *c*).

wrote for Jewish Christians or otherwise for Jews, has more diligently than Mark set forth, by means of his version of the Sermon on the Mount, the conservative position of Jesus towards the Old Testament law. But that he has urged it in the sense of an abiding validity of the Mosaic law more strongly than the apostolic source, cannot be proved. Rather he loves to set forth prominently, how Jesus, in the way of the old prophets (§ 24, *c*), puts more value on pitying love than on sacrifice (ix. 13, xii. 7; comp. Mark xii. 23), and set His person above the Holy Place of the Old Covenant (xii. 6). In his interpretation of the words, xv. 11–20, there appears a contrast between the law of meats and that of purification, which is not found in the older representation in Mark. Deeds, according to which Christ, when He comes again, will judge (xvi. 27), are according to the connection the proof of following Him in self-denial and self-sacrifice (vv. 24, 25). The commands which the exalted Christ lays on His confessors to keep (xxviii. 20), are no longer the Mosaic, but His own (comp. § 52, *a*; 135, *a*).[6]

(*d*) The more that the gospel was rejected by the Jews, and the apostolic mission therefore turned to the Gentiles, the more natural was it to examine the sayings of Jesus handed down on the point, in so far as they pointed out this course of development, or even were in harmony with it. From this point of view Mark thought that he had to premise, that the word about the children and the dogs (Matt. xv. 26) only guarded the historical prerogative of the Jews, and did not exclude the Gentiles (vii. 27: *ἄφες πρῶτον χορτασθῆναι τὰ τέκνα*; comp. Rom. i. 16), as he also expressly mentions that Jesus, by simply entering into a Gentile house, in harmony with His position towards the Jewish scruples about cleanness (vv. 2–4), yet had not by any means intended any activity on Gentile territory (vii. 24). On the other hand, he widens the intimation, according to which the apostles would stand before Gentile tribunals, in order to testify to

[6] Accordingly the *ἀνομία*, which, xiii. 41, is threatened with judgment, cannot be Paulinism free from the law, but only heathen-Christian libertinism (§ 110, *a*, 128, *d*; 135, *a*, footnote 4), of which, along with the false prophecy, which favoured it, Jesus prophesied (xxiv. 11, 12), and which, in spite of all deeds in His name, He condemns (vii. 22, 23).

the Gentile (Matt. x. 18); hence, that before the end the gospel had to be preached to all the Gentiles (xiii. 10), a proposition evidently founded on the Petrine universalism (§ 50, *d*), and even, xiv. 9, he had the proclamation of the gospel in all the world already in his eye. But, conformable to the destination of his gospel, the question must have interested our evangelist in the liveliest way, how it came to pass that Israel's Messiah had yet not brought salvation to His people. He begins by confirming the promise of the prophet by the words of the angel, according to which Messiah was appointed to deliver *His people* (i. 21). But he shows immediately how the new-born King of the Jews was persecuted by Israel's king, while Gentiles coming from far paid Him homage (chap. ii.); he even emphasizes the participation of all Syria in the activity of Jesus, after he has by the prophecy in ver. 15 included the Gentiles in and about Galilee in the destination for the Messianic salvation, as he also gives for the same reason hope to the Gentiles, xii. 21, and in one of the Lord's first miracles he inserts a statement which predicts the casting away of Israel and the receiving of the Gentiles (viii. 11, 12). He yet shows how Jesus on His part had done nothing to bring about this catastrophe. While he puts the words of direction spoken to the disciples, when sent out on trial, on a level with those spoken to the apostles generally, he yet acknowledges that Jesus had originally limited the mission of the Twelve to Israel (x. 5, 6) as He limited His own (xv. 24), nay, he shrinks from allowing him to tread Gentile territory (vv. 21 f., 29). Only after Jesus has definitely broken with the blood-stained hierarchy (xxi. 39–41) does he bring forward Jesus' second prophetic word, which announces the catastrophe (xxi. 43). Only after that Jesus has announced destruction for the city and temple (xxii. 7, xxiv. 2) does he bring forward from Mark the prophecy of a mission to the Gentiles, which must precede the end (xxiv. 14). Only after the hierarchy has misled the people, by the vilest imposture, to regard the message of the resurrection as a lie (xxviii. 11–15), does he allow the exalted Messiah to send His apostles to *all* nations (ver. 19). Thus it was no blame of Jesus if Israel did not become partakers of the promise. Because the people, misled

by their own leaders, fell under judgment, the gospel had to turn from the Jews to the Gentiles.[7]

§ 137. *The Writings of Luke.*

The Gospel of Luke makes the destination of salvation for the Gentiles prominent with a doctrinal intention, even though it is not to the extent and with the one-sidedness which criticism has supposed it has found it (*a*). The acknowledgment of the law is not entirely denied by Jesus; the ascetic way of looking at riches and poverty, which has, to be sure, become strongly prominent in Luke, has nothing to do with Jewish legalism (*b*). The Acts of the Apostles show how, by explicitly divine indications, the transference of the gospel from the Jews to the Gentiles was effected, till Gentile missions reached in their progress westward the world's capital (*c*). This apology for the world-historical course of the development of Christianity comes of itself to be an apology for the great apostle of the Gentiles (*d*).

(*a*). Since the Gospel of Luke openly acknowledges the intention to confirm doctrine, and especially, as we shall see, § 139, Pauline doctrine (i. 4), it is certainly significant that in its early history the Messiah is praised as the light of the Gentiles (ii. 32), and that His genealogy is traced back to Adam (iii. 23–38). But, above all, it is occasioned by this doctrinal intention, that the representation of His Galilean activity opens with the scene in the synagogue of Nazareth, which not only indicates beforehand the rejection of Jesus by His people (iv. 24), but also, at the same time, points prophetically to this, that the salvation, of which Israel had shown themselves unworthy, must come to the Gentiles

[7] Yet Jerusalem continued to be to the evangelist the holy city (iv. 5, xxvii. 53; comp. v. 35: πόλις τοῦ μεγάλου βασιλέως), as it was to the author of the Apocalypse (xi. 2; comp. xxi. 2–10, xxii. 19), although judgment had already gone forth against it (Matt. xxii. 7), and the Old Testament pious were ἅγιοι (xxvii. 52). Nay, it appears that, quite like the author of the Apocalypse (§ 130, *c*, footnote 5), he had thought but of the conversion of individuals among the Gentiles, since the nations, as such, at the last judgment stand over against the brethren (*i.e.* the fellow-citizens) of Jesus, but are, to be sure, only judged on this point, whether they have shown love to these or not (Matt. xxv. 31 f., 40, 45). Comp. Schenkel, p. 173.

(iv. 25–27).[1] It has to be conceded, that Luke has omitted expressions from the apostolic source, as Matt. vii. 6, x. 5, 6, xv. 24, xxii. 14, because they might have been misunderstood in a particularist sense; but also, xiii. 30, is an expression of Jesus applied, contrary to its original sense (comp. § 32, *b*), to the rejection of Israel and the calling of the Gentiles; and, xiv. 22, to the parable of the feast a thought is added, which points to the Petrine doctrine (§ 91, *a*) of the coming of the Gentiles into the place of the cast-off Israelites. Since Mark xiii. 10 is left out, even so here the Risen One just gives the direct command for missions to the Gentiles (xxiv. 47; comp. Acts i. 8). On the other hand, Luke has omitted neither the Messianic character of Jesus' appearance, nor the historical significance of His salvation for Israel. Rather Jesus appears in the early portions of the history, which the author has taken from his sources, as the Son of God, crowned with the highest name of honour, who, upon the throne of His father David, sets up the eternal kingdom over the house of Jacob (i. 32, 33), assumes it for Himself, on the ground of the Abrahamitic covenant (vv. 54, 55), and through a political deliverance lays the foundation for the Messianic consummation (vv. 68–75; comp. ii. 38). The Saviour of the whole nation is born in the Messiah (ii. 10, 11; comp. ver. 26); and even where He is

[1] If, on the other hand, Luke already divides Christ's public ministry into a Galilean (iv. 14–ix. 50) and an extra-Galilean ministry (ix. 51–xix. 27), that is just an attempt to separate the traditional materials in a way more suitable for historical narrative; for neither is it clear that the latter was exclusively engaged on Samaritan territory, nor that Jesus had met here with a better reception, as Baur, p. 329, conjectures. This section, too, begins with the rejection of Jesus in a Samaritan village (ix. 53); but the stories of the merciful and thankful Samaritans (chap. x. 17) contain no prejudice in favour of the question towards the attainment of salvation. Quite as little is it certainly clear, that the sending out of the seventy disciples, resting as it does on a literary combination (x. 1; comp. *Jahrbucher*, 1864, p. 66), is a type of the mission to the Gentiles; and that the Twelve, whose original destination was confined to Israel, is to be put down in contrast to these, is entirely an utterly unproveable imagination of criticism (comp. on the other hand, *Stud. u. Krit.* 1861, p. 710 ff.). But if criticism has pointed out a series of parables and other incidents pointing to the Pauline universal sense, it has also partly overlooked the hints of the author, who would have these to be regarded as anti-pharisaic (xiv. 15, 16, xv. 1, 2, xvi. 14, 15), and it has partly dragged in this reference only by arbitrary allegorizing.

designated as a light to the Gentiles (ver. 32), His appearance yet tends at the same time to the glorification of His people Israel, if even but a portion of them are actually delivered by Him (ver. 34). Here too, therefore, in conformity with prophecy, Jesus has come, in the first place, for the salvation of Israel (xiii. 16, xix. 9);[2] but in a clause, inwoven with the parable of the talents, Luke has set forth in a striking allegory how Jesus' fellow-citizens, when He had gone away to get possession of His Messianic kingdom, rebelled against that kingdom, and on that account fell under judgment (xix. 12, 14, 27).

(*b*) If Luke has intentionally omitted from the Sermon on the Mount Jesus' lawgiving, as it no longer had any interest to His Jewish-Christian readers, who were free from the law, he has yet preserved, xvi. 17, His explanation of the abiding significance of the law in principle (§ 24, *a*).[3] Here, too, Jesus recognises the commandments of the law (x. 26, xviii. 20) as commandments of God, and the significance of Moses and the prophets as leading to repentance (xvi. 29–31). As He urges the fulfilment of legal institutions, so He praises the piety of the Old Testament law (i. 6, ii. 25, 37). Chap. v. 39 contains a mild apology, peculiar to our Gospel, for clinging to old usages; and it is presupposed, xxiii. 56, that the followers of Jesus strictly observed the Sabbath law. How high a value Luke places on deeds that are well-pleasing is clear from this, that

[2] With the proclamation of the fulfilment of Scripture Jesus Himself comes forward (iv. 21), and the chief work of the Risen One consists in this, to open the understanding of the disciples to understand the Scriptures, which prophesied of His death and resurrection (xxiv. 44–46; comp. vv. 25–27, 32). But the evangelist has not only accepted Mark's references to the Scriptures (iii. 4–6, xx. 17, xxii. 22), but he has even increased them (xviii. 31, xxii. 37). Here, too, Jesus is the promised Messiah of Israel, the Anointed One (iv. 41, ix. 20), or the Holy One of God (iv. 34); the Messianic King (xix. 38), or the Son of God, in the Messianic sense (iv. 41; comp. vv. 3, 9), the Son of David (xviii. 38, 39, xx. 41–44).

[3] If all legal prescriptions were fulfilled even to the child Jesus (ii. 21–24), that appears, to be sure, as an illustration of Gal. iv. 4, only that this is yet presented with a doctrinal intention. On the other hand, Matt. xxiii. 2, 3 is intentionally omitted, because this statement was so easily misunderstood, and was intelligible only on presuppositions, which were quite awanting to his readers. But as Baur, p. 328, xvi. 17, prefers the Marcionite reading, which is contrary to the context (comp. Lechler, p. 158), so has he, in xvi. 16, arbitrarily introduced an antithesis contrary to Matt. xi. 13; and if a recommendation of the Pauline freedom from the law of meats is sought in x. 8, it is overlooked that the decisive πᾶν is awanting in 1 Cor. x. 27.

he turns Jesus' prescription, given in a particular case (Mark x. 21), into a general one (xii. 23, xi. 41); and he explains the parable of the unjust steward directly in the sense of winning heavenly reward by such deeds (xvi. 9).[4] But this rests deeper on an ascetic view of the world, which looks on riches as in themselves ruinous, because they so easily shut the heart to the gospel (comp. Mark x. 23, 24), and on poverty as in itself saving. Luke has, in this sense, changed the beatitudes of the Sermon on the Mount (vi. 20, 21, 24, 25); he predicts unrighteousness even of mammon (xvi. 9, 11); at the coming of the last judgment, he has seen deliverance only in the complete putting away of all earthly possessions (xvii. 31, 32); and he has given to the parable of the rich man a one-sided colouring in the first half, which is expressly contrasted in the second (xvi. 25, 26), by which the future retribution brings but the inversion of earthly relations of poverty and riches.

(*c*) The Acts of the Apostles show how the early apostles, after their significant number twelve was completed (i. 26), began to fulfil the missionary commission of their Lord (i. 8), when the Jewish-Christian original church was founded at Jerusalem (chap. ii.), but immediately got into conflict with the unbelieving hierarchy (chaps. iii.–v.), till the people, at first favourable to the Church, changed their mind by the appearance of Stephen, killed him, and proceeded to persecute the Church (chaps. vi.–viii. 1). Not according to human counsel and choice, but in consequence of the dispersion thence resulting, the further extension of Christianity begins in the second part, according to the programme presented i. 8 (viii. 1–4). The conversion of Samaria, which, viii. 17, has expressly apostolic sanction, and the first baptism of proselytes, which is brought about by wonderful events of God (vv. 26, 29),

[4] In this sense he has with special predilection painted the community of goods among the first Christians with special fondness, and with an over-estimation exceeding far the historical reality (§ 41, *b*) as verified by his own statements (Acts ii. 44, 45, iv. 32–35), and elsewhere, too, he has set forth alms-deeds as something specially worthy of praise (Acts ix. 36, x. 2). With the ascetic tendency ascribed to Luke in what follows, compare also the laudatory importance attributed to the long widowhood of Anna the prophetess (ii. 36, 37), which, however, has its counterpart in the retention of the expression of the συνευχίζειν ἑαυτὸν διὰ τὴν βασιλείαν (Matt. xix. 12).

form the transition, as it were, to the conversion of the Gentiles now in sight. By a chain of wonderful divine events Peter is brought to baptize the first Gentile, a deed he defends at Jerusalem as one plainly willed of God (ix. 32–xi. 18); and then the first Gentile-Christian church is likewise founded at Antioch, with God's help, without any formed plan, by the force of events (xi. 20, 21). But only after that the capital of Judaism had been stained by the blood of one of the twelve apostles, and Peter had escaped the same fate only by a miracle (chap. xii.), the first ordination of Paul and Barnabas to Gentile lands from Antioch followed by divine direction (xiii. 2).[5] And also on their missionary journey (chaps. xiii., xiv.) is the gospel first brought to the Jews of the dispersion, and only after they have rejected it is it brought to the Gentiles (xiii. 46, 47). Through the results of this mission is the question raised in reference to the relation of Gentile Christians to the law, and at the apostolic council at Jerusalem decided in favour of freedom from the law for the Gentile churches (chap. xv.). Therewith is the way prepared for the gospel passing, as appointed by God, but brought about by the unbelief of the Jews, from the Jew to the Gentile on all sides; and now the third part shows how the Pauline mission to the Gentiles again, by divine direction, passes over from Asia to Europe (xvi. 6–10). It lingers at the founding of the chief churches of Paul at Philippi, Thessalonica, and Corinth (chaps. xvi.–xviii.), and describes the apostle's work at Ephesus (chap. xix.), as also his solemn departure from his former mission territory (chap. xx.). The narrative lingers over the details of the journey to Jerusalem, forced on the apostle by the Spirit in spite of all warnings to the contrary (chap. xxi.), by which the necessity to go to Rome, confessed by him long before (xix. 21), and confirmed to him by God (xxiii. 11), was realized, in a way contrary to all

[5] Indeed, in chap. ii., in the conception of the miracle of tongues at the feast of Pentecost, is indicated beforehand the universal destination of the gospel. Chap. ix., we have the conversion of Saul, whose name significantly emerges at the beginning of the part (viii. 1, 3; comp. vii. 58), and his calling to the apostleship of the Gentiles is recorded (ix. 15; comp. xx. 15, 21, xxvi. 16 f.), as he who finds in Antioch the special sphere for his activity (xi. 21–26), and in this journey he soon obtains precedence of Barnabas, after having taken the name of Paul (comp. xiii. 13).

human expectation, by a series of wonderful divine events and deliverances (chaps. xxii.–xxviii.), and concludes with the preaching of the apostle at Rome during his two years' imprisonment (xxviii. 30, 31). It is therefore the victorious course of the gospel through the Gentile world, as directed by God, to its establishment in the world's capital, which is here presented, and with it the course of the development of the Church from the Jews to the Gentiles, from Jerusalem to Rome.

(*d*) If the whole history of the apostles is an apology for the course of the development of Christianity in the sense of § 114, *b*, then the third part in particular must be an apology of him, who was the chiefest forwarder of this development at its most decisive turning-point. That the Apostle of the Gentiles for himself, as was asserted from a Jewish or a Jewish-Christian side, was no enemy of the law of the fathers, is shown from his seeking feasts and keeping them (xx. 6, 16, xxiv. 11, perhaps also xviii. 21), from his vows and his vow of a Nazarite (xviii. 18, xxi. 26), from the circumcision of Timothy (xvi. 3), and from his words of self-defence, in which he represents himself throughout as a pious Israelite, true to the faith and the hope of the fathers (xxiii. 1, 6, xxiv. 14, 15, xxvi. 5–7, xxviii. 20; comp. § 87, *b*); that he has not denied the prerogative of his people, is shown from the way in which he always first turned with his message to the Jews (xvi. 13, xvii. 2, 10; comp. ix. 22, 29), and only when these latter rejected it, he went to the Gentiles (xviii. 6, 7, xix. 8, 9, xxviii. 24–28; comp. xiii. 45–47). But, in opposition to those who stirred up the early Church against him (xxi. 21), it is diligently shown how he had been in many ways in the most friendly intercourse with the most important individuals of it—as Ananias and Barnabas, Mark and Silas, nay, even with James, the Lord's brother. But that the author, in this apologetic effort, or in the interest of conciliation, had either Paulinized Peter or Judaized Paul (comp. Baur, pp. 331–333) is, as our whole representation of the doctrine of both shows, not proved

§ 138. *Christology, Eschatology, Angelology.*

That the representation of Jesus' life in our Gospels is

warped by a fully developed idea of Jesus' higher nature, cannot be proved; at the most, there is shown a tendency to conceive more concretely of the miraculous in Jesus' life (*a*). This holds good more especially of the conception of the resurrection body of Jesus and of His ascension by Luke; while as regards their conception of the supernatural, no adequate motive is shown in the circle of the evangelist's view to account for its invention (*b*). The interpretation of the prophecy of the second coming, it is self-evident, is modified by the circumstances of the evangelist's times (*c*). Peculiar ideas about angels and daemons are also shown in many ways in the historical books (*d*).

(*a*) The easy supposition that the conceptions about Jesus' person, which had sprung up in the Church in consequence of the exaltation of the Messiah, had produced a change on the representation of His historical life in our Gospels, is not made good on more searching examination. Even Luke, who alone uses the name of the exalted Christ (ὁ κύριος) by way of anticipation during His earthly life (vii. 13, and nine times besides),[1] exhibits Him as developing in quite a human way (ii. 40, 52), and, even after His victory over the devil in the wilderness, as being tempted by him during His life (iv. 13, xxii. 28).[2] The suspicion, likewise, in many ways asserted,

[1] Just so it occurs in the unauthentic conclusion of the Gospel of Mark (xvi. 19, 20), and similarly in the Epistle to the Hebrews (§ 118, *a*). In the Acts of the Apostles, when the work of the exalted Christ is dealt with, the name ὁ κύριος, which also is very frequently used of God, as in citations (vii. 33, x. 33, xvii. 24, and frequently), is quite in its stead, but it *never* stands without the article. Elsewhere in the speeches of the Acts, and quite as in the narratives of the evangelists, the name Ἰησοῦς is used preponderatingly (comp. § 118, *a*, footnote 1), about forty times, proportionably therefore much more frequently than by Paul (§ 76, *a*, footnote 1; 100, *c*, footnote 8); it is often connected with ὁ κύριος (xvi. 31, xix. 5, 13, 17, xx. 24, 35, xxi. 13; comp. § 134, *a*, footnote 1). It is almost only in solemn designations that Ἰησοῦς Χριστός occurs (x. 48, xiv. 10, xvi. 18), joined only with ὁ κύριος, xi. 17, xxviii. 31, with ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν, xv. 26, xx. 21. The name ὁ Χριστός occurs also in the later part of the Acts only as an appellative, as § 41, *a*, footnote 1 (ix. 22, xvii. 3, xviii. 5, 28, xxvi. 23). Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς stands quite alone, xxiv. 24.

[2] If, even in Matt. xxiv. 36, the οὐδὲ ὁ υἱός from Mark xiii. 32 is awanting, which from textual criticism is quite unlikely, then is it, so far as the thing is concerned, compensated by the added μόνος. Luke seems to have really first stumbled at this, and he brings the expression, Acts i. 7, into a setting which denies to the disciples a knowledge of times and seasons. A narrative of Mark, which originally had not this in view, is understood by him as an evidence of

that the tradition of Jesus' miracles was painted in ever more glowing colours, that the deeds of power ascribed to Him had ever grown greater, is not verified, so far as we can follow from the sources this development, since the oldest form of the tradition known to us already records the most striking acts of power (§ 18, *b*).[3] Even the later evangelists are far removed from attributing to Jesus divine omnipotence. They even refer the miracles, as does the oldest tradition, to the power of God (of the Spirit), which at such moments came down on Him (Luke v. 17), or to the divine miraculous help which was given Him (Matt. xv. 31; Luke ix. 43, xvii. 15, 18). Only the (exalted) Christ, appearing after His resurrection, claimed for Himself divine omnipotence and omnipresence (Matt. xxviii. 18, 20), and is worshipped (xxviii. 9, 17), which Schenkel, p. 365, overlooks. On the other hand, the peculiar tendency to regard what is plastically represented as a concrete event, becomes apparent. While the descent of the Spirit in the sight of the Baptist is compared in the oldest tradition to the gliding downward of a dove (comp. Matt. iii. 16), even in Mark the Spirit Himself appears as a dove (i. 10), and no doubt apparently, as is added by way of explanation by Luke iii. 22, in the concrete form of a dove; but what with Mark is but a vision to Jesus, already appears in Luke quite as an objective detail (iii. 21), in which no doubt it is to be noticed, that the oldest tradition undoubtedly presupposed such an event as lying at the basis of that vision (comp. § 18, *a*).[4] Even the transfiguration of Jesus was in

Jesus' wonderful prescience (xix. 32; comp. my *Marcus*, p. 367), and in a similar way Matthew appears to have understood an enigmatic expression of Jesus (xvii. 27).

[3] Only in Mark v. 30 is the healing of the woman with the issue of blood referred to a magical miraculous power streaming from Jesus, of which the oldest form of the narrative knew nothing (§ 29, *c*), and the stilling of the storm on the lake, as also the raising of the maiden, results, according to Mark, from an express word of power on the part of Jesus (iv. 39, v. 41; comp. also Luke vii. 14). If one believes that he may on critical grounds regard as not historical the rending of the veil of the temple (Mark xv. 38; comp. § 136, *a*), the deliverance of the presumptuous Peter from the destruction threatening him in the storm (Matt. xiv. 28–31), the opening of the graves occasioned by the death of Christ (Matt. xxvii. 52, 53), and similar events in the Gospel narrative, then there lies in these not any tendency to exaggeration of the miracles in Jesus' life, but a transposition of ideal thoughts into real history in the tradition.

[4] Even the oldest preaching knew of an anointing of the Messiah with the

the oldest tradition, the original form of which is preserved for us 2 Pet. i. 16–18 (comp. § 127, *b*), certainly a vision of the apostle's; but it is already regarded as brought about in Mark (ix. 2) as by an actual changing of the earthly body of Jesus into the heavenly light-substance, in which it is hoped the returning Messiah will be seen.

(*b*) If, in the latest of our three evangelists, an earthly material is expressly attributed to the resurrection body of Christ (Luke xxiv. 39: *σάρκα καὶ ὀστέα . . . ἔχον*), and the Risen One eats with His disciples (vv. 42, 43), then the reality of Jesus' body after the resurrection is conceived of as one identical with His former body in a way which contradicts all the notices elsewhere. The necessary result of this was, that the period in which Christ yet appeared to His disciples was more sharply separated from that in which He was taken up to abide at God's right hand, and carried with Him no more this earthly corporeity.[5] Neither Peter (§ 39, *b*; 50, *a*) nor Paul (§ 78, *a*, footnote 2) makes any such distinction, and in the source made use of in Luke xxiv. 26 itself, the exaltation to dominion follows directly on the suffering of death; and Matt. xxviii. 17, 18, He who had been exalted to divine dominion appears to His apostles (comp. note *a*). Only, in the two later Gospels also is the miraculous conception of Jesus thought of. But although there has been found therein, Matt. i. 22, 23, a fulfilment of the prophecy Isa. vii. 14, yet neither can it have been invented as a proof of this fulfilment, since no pre-Christian interpretation of that passage referred to the birth of Messiah by a virgin, nor is there any discussion

Spirit (§ 38, *b*), and it would hence be certainly a mistake to look, with Baur, p. 301, upon the miracle of the dove as an invention of tradition. Whether already in the oldest source the appearance of the devil and the angels in the history of the temptation was set forth as in bodily form, as in the first Gospel, is very unlikely, according to Luke. Only it is certain, that both narratives conceived of Jesus' fasting in the wilderness as absolute (Matt. iv. 2; Luke iv. 2), although it was without doubt relative, conditioned by the situation.

[5] Hence this took place, Acts i. 3, after a definite number of days, and a concrete lifting up into heaven is connected with Jesus' final departure, which is, to be sure, covered by the mystery of the veiling cloud (ver. 9), while yet, Luke xxiv. 51, according to the accredited text, His last disappearance was not different from that at the other appearances of the Risen One (comp. xxiv. 31). On the other hand, even Mark xvi. 19, as the sitting down at the right hand of God shows, is a dogmatic statement and no historical narrative.

on this fulfilment, since the whole stress from the context is laid on this, how one born of a virgin can yet be regarded as the legitimate heir of the royal house of David (§ 136, *b*). The representation of the evangelists hence certainly presupposes this fact to be one already resting on tradition, and it is certainly false to believe this tradition to have arisen as an exaggeration of the idea of the anointing of Messiah by the Spirit of God.[6] But in both evangelists there is brought into prominence only the Messianic character in general, but not any determination of the nature of Jesus' person as the consequence of this birth, which had been brought about by God in a special sense, not to speak then of its being then verified that this supernatural character would prove thereby the fact of this birth by a woman.[7] It thus only remains further for Biblical theology, which has not to investigate the historicity of this tradition, to prove that, in the circle of ideas from which it emerged, there is no point of support to explain its origin from given ideas.

(*c*) The more that, according to § 114, *b*, the chief interest of this time is centred in the question of Christ's second coming, the more must there have been stamped on the setting of the words about the Parousia, what the signs of the

[6] If the divinely produced conception of Mary is referred to the Holy Ghost (Matt. i. 20; Luke i. 35), then is He only regarded, as in Christ's miracles, as the effective power of God (δύναμις ὑψίστου), which effected miracles; but He is by no means represented, as Baur, p. 200, supposes, as the immanent, the innermost central-point of the principle, which forms the personality of Jesus. To speak entirely of Gnosticizing speculations, which are to find their expression even in Matt. xvi. 16, Luke ix. 20 (Schenkel, p. 364 f.), is quite perverse.

[7] To refer the origin of this idea to Gentile-Christian circles, which might have further admitted the comprehension of the name υἱὸς θεοῦ, and might have understood it in the sense of the heathen myths about sons of the gods, is neither possible historically, nor would it explain the emergence of it in the midst of Jewish-Christian tradition. If from this birth, produced by the Holy Ghost, is inferred, Luke i. 35, not only the consecration of Him who was thus born to God (τὸ γεννώμενον ἅγιον), but also the name of honour, υἱὸς θεοῦ, then Luke appears, here at any rate, as iii. 38, where the τοῦ θεοῦ—and therefore also all the other preceding genitives—can depend only on the υἱός of ver. 23, to refer this name, which elsewhere he understands quite in its Messianic sense, to the miraculous generation by God, and the thought is suggested, that he already implies a reference thereby to the Pauline ἔσχατος Ἀδάμ (comp. § 79, *a*), perhaps he has so far thought of it as the consequence of the Pauline premises of § 78, *b*. But that this was a tradition given him, and that it had its origin in Jewish-Christian circles, is unquestionable.

time suggested to the Church for the interpretation and the more exact determination of Jesus' prophecy. The Gospel of Mark, which elsewhere likes to point to the persecutions for which Jesus' disciples must be prepared (x. 30; comp. iv. 17), has enumerated them among the forerunners of the Parousia (xiii. 9–13), and, in complete dependence on the Apocalypse (§ 130, *c*), has referred the unheard-of troubles which Jesus, according to the oldest tradition, saw coming upon the Jewish people (§ 33, *b*), to these trials of believers generally (vv. 19, 20; comp. also § 30, *d*, footnote 1). The catastrophe in Judaea, which, according to the former, the Parousia is immediately to follow, stands now quite, as in the Apocalypse, at the beginning of the last great time of tribulation for the Church, which the Parousia ends (ver. 24). To be sure, the gospel is first to be proclaimed among all nations (ver. 10); but Rom. i. 8 shows how near, even before a decade, this goal might appear, according to the unheard-of results of the mission of Paul. The first evangelist had already seen, in the flames of Jerusalem, the judgment on the enemies of Messiah (Matt. xxii. 7); among the dangers prophesied by Christ to tempt Christians to fall away, he must have counted (xxiv. 11, 12) Gentile-Christian antinomianism with its false prophecy (§ 136, *c*, footnote 6), and he could, xxiv. 30, point to the token, prophesied Rev. i. 7, of the visible appearing of the Son of man. He hopes this second coming, for which he has already used the apostolic term *παρουσία* (xxiv. 3, 37, 39), to be so near, that the flight of the apostles from Palestine will not be ended before the Deliverer comes (x. 23). Luke, too, had already seen Jerusalem compassed by enemies, besieged and desolated (xix. 43, 44, xxi. 20; comp. xxiii. 28–31), but the second coming had not come directly thereupon; but there had followed the times of the rule of the Gentiles over Israel which the Apocalypse, xi. 2, had prophesied (xxi. 22), and of which the signs of the times even now announced (ver. 28). He had already beheld persecutions of the Christians, which had come earlier than the woes prophesied for the last time, § 33, *b* (xxi. 12: *πρὸ δὲ τούτων*); but referring to the Apocalypse (§ 130, *c*), he could announce to believers preservation in the last troubles (vv. 18, 19). The first evangelist loves, as Luke does (xii. 8, 9), to make

Christ come forth as the Judge of the world (vii. 22, 23, xvi. 27, xix. 28, xxv. 31); and he has, xxv. 32 (comp. § 33, *c*), transformed Christ's words of instruction into a view of the general judgment (comp. § 33, *c*, footnote 6; 136, *d*, footnote 7).[8] Both also designate the perfected kingdom as the kingdom of Christ (Luke xxii. 29 f., xxiii. 42; Matt. xiii. 41, xvi. 28, xx. 21; comp. § 110, *b*; 129, *d*),—the latter, in particular, as the kingdom of heaven.[9] In it begins, as in the Apocalypse (§ 132, *c*), the marriage-feast of the Messiah (xxii. 2, 3), at which believers enter into the joy of their Lord (xxv. 21, 23), and, according to Dan. xii. 3, shine in the heavenly glory like the sun (xiii. 43).[10]

[8] In the passage where Mark distinguishes the present from the retribution then following, which verifies its equivalence by the transposition of human destinies (x. 31; comp. § 32, *b*), in which the Christian receives full compensation for what he has given up for the sake of Christ, he designates, as Paul (§ 67, *a*), the two ages of the world as ὁ καιρὸς οὗτος and ὁ αἰὼν ὁ ἐρχόμενος (comp. Matt. xii. 32: οὗτος ὁ αἰὼν . . . ὁ μέλλων; Luke xx. 34, 35: οὗτος . . . ἐκεῖνος. Comp. ἡ ἡμέρα ἐκείνη: Luke x. 12; Matt. vii. 22). This present is also called the αἰών simply, and is characterized by earthly cares (Mark iv. 19), as by Luke by a worldly mind (xvi. 18: υἱοὶ τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου), and by an earthly-minded life (xx. 24). In the first Gospel, humanity belonging to this present world is already designated, quite in the Pauline fashion, as ὁ κόσμος (v. 14, xiii. 38, xviii. 7; comp. Luke xii. 30). Christ's second coming to judgment forms with him the dividing point of the two worlds, — a second coming which follows on the συντέλεια τοῦ αἰῶνος (xiii. 39, 40, 49, xxiv. 3, xxviii. 20) and on the παλιγγενεσία (xix. 28), by which is meant the world's transformation (§ 132, *c*).

[9] This latter expression, peculiar to the first evangelist *only*, originally involves the idea that the perfection of salvation, or the perfected kingdom of God, is only realized in heaven, and is selected by the evangelist because, with the fall of Jerusalem, the hope of a perfecting of the theocracy in Israel on earth vanished (comp. my *Matthäus*, pp. 39, 102). Therewith is removed the one objection which Schürer (*Jahrb. f. prot. Theol.* 1876, 2, p. 183) brings forward against the evident introduction of the expression by the first evangelist. But that this expression may be explained from the rabbinical passages adduced by him, in which οὐρανοί is simply a circumlocution for God, and which does not there admittedly occur (p. 180), Lipsius (same magazine, 1877, 4, p. 189 ff.) has rightly doubted, only that he continues to abide by the coming down of the kingdom from heaven, which does not lie mainly in the expression. If, now, the evangelist has substituted this expression even there for that used in the oldest tradition (ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ), when it is not the kingdom in the future world that is meant (v. 3, 10, 19, xi. 11, xiii. 11, 24, 31, 33), it is evident from this that, ideally considered, in the salvation already given the consummation of salvation secured thereby is thought of as already present (comp. § 117, *d*).

[10] In contrast to this, the evangelist likes to represent the fate of the godless,

(*d*) In the Gospel of Mark, the messenger of God who at the grave announces the resurrection to the women appears as a young man in white raiment (xvi. 5).[11] In the first Gospel, on the other hand, the angel who by an earthquake opens the grave and announces the resurrection (xxviii. 2, 5) is simply an ἄγγελος κυρίου, מַלְאַךְ יְהוָה, who appears in the divine δόξα, so that he appears to be shining like lightning, and his raiment to be white as snow (ver. 3). It is such a messenger of God who gives the revelations of God in the history of the childhood, and this he so does that he appears in a dream (i. 20, 24, ii. 13, 19; comp. ii. 12, 22).[12] In the Gospel of Mark the angels in whose company Christ comes again are designated as holy (viii. 38; comp. Luke ix. 26; Acts x. 22), as in Peter (§ 127, *d*, footnote 9); and in the first Gospel they

in connection with the oldest tradition (§ 34, *d*), as the darkness of misery that rules outside the kingdom of God, a darkness which is endured with wailing and gnashing of teeth (xxii. 13, xxv. 30; comp. xiii. 42, 50, xxiv. 51). What is there designated as a hell of fire appears here as a reminiscence of the lake of fire of the Apocalypse (§ 132, *b*), as a fire-oven (xiii. 42, 50; comp. Dan. iii. 6, and in Mark ix. 43–48), as inextinguishable fire (comp. Isa. lxvi. 24).

[11] In the parallel passage in Luke there are two men in shining garments, who appear suddenly (xxiv. 4) and inspire those present with awful fear, so that they bend their faces to the earth (ver. 5). But the entire occurrence in xxiv. 23 is designated as a vision of angels. Just so the two men in white garments, who stand suddenly by the disciples as they look up to Him who had been taken away (Acts i. 10), are undoubtedly thought of as angels. But that these two—when it is not explicitly said—angels are thought of as in human form, is clear from Acts x. 30, where the angel of God that appeared to Cornelius (x. 3, 7, 22) is designated by him as a man in white garments. If, Acts vi. 15, the face of Stephen appears as the face of an angel, it follows from this that this face is conceived of after a human analogy, but glorified by a heavenly glory. If, Acts xxvii. 23, an angel of God appeared to Paul in the night, this may be regarded as a vision in a dream. The appearing of an angel from heaven, to strengthen Jesus when in prayer at Gethsemane (Luke xxii. 43), is critically uncertain. In the speech of Stephen, Jehovah Himself speaks with Moses in the burning bush (Acts vii. 30, 35, 38).

[12] It is such an one also who, in one of the sources used by Luke in the Acts of the Apostles, brings to Philip the message from God (viii. 26), who delivers Peter from the prison (xii. 7–11; comp. v. 19), and slays Herod by a mortal sickness (xii. 23). Here, too, there streams around him, xii. 7, the light of the divine glory. On the other hand, it is the angel of the Lord who in the history of the childhood in Luke brings the revelations of God (i. 11, ii. 9); he is expressly designated (i. 19, 26) as one of the seven angels about the throne (§ 133, *b*, footnote 3), by name Gabriel (Dan. viii. 16, ix. 21); while, with a host of the heavenly army, ii. 15, who celebrate by a song of praise the birth of Messiah (ver. 13), he is classed under the category of ἄγγελοι generally.

serve as helpers in the execution of the Messianic judgment (xiii. 39, 41, 49), as in the Apocalypse (§ 133, *b*).[13] The idea of guardian angels, which we there formed, appears, Acts xii. 15, extended to individual persons, and in such a way that the guardian angel is thought to be like him whom he guards. According to Matt. xviii. 10, the guardian angels of children are taken from the throne-angels. Luke makes Satan, after he has been conquered by Jesus in the wilderness (iv. 13), enter into Judas, plainly in order to tempt Jesus by suffering, and to mislead him to betray (xxii. 3), as he misled Ananias to falsehood (Acts v. 3; comp. xiii. 10: *υἱὲ διαβόλου*). Because the dominion of Satan leads his servants to sins, which bring death with himself, deliverance from his power appears, Acts xxvi. 18, as a fundamental fact of salvation (comp. § 104, *b*).[14]

§ 139. *The Paulinism of Luke.*

Although Luke wishes to be a follower of Paul, yet he has scarcely comprehended the significance of Paul's doctrine of justification in principle (*a*). To be sure, he likes to bring

[13] They similarly appear, Luke xii. 8, 9, about Christ in His judicial functions, xv. 10, as participators in the joy of God over repentant sinners. The idea, moreover, is peculiar by which angels carry the pious dead to the bosom of Abraham (xvi. 22).

[14] Even Mark referred the birds of heaven in the parable (Matt. xiii. 4) by way of allegory to Satan, who sought to hinder the activity of Jesus in founding His kingdom (Mark iv. 15; comp. Matt. xiii. 19: *ὁ πονηρός*); and the first evangelist has introduced the *ἐχθρός* into the parable of the tares (xiii. 25, 28), in order that he may point to the devil as the author of the intermixture of evil in the kingdom of God (xiii. 38, 39: *ὁ διάβολος* = *ὁ πονηρός*; comp. § 104, *b*, footnote 4). In the later form of the tradition an inclination is shown to trace even such diseases to Satanic origin as, according to the earlier conception, were not of a daemonic kind, as the epilepsy of the sick one, Mark ix. 17 (comp. Matt. xvii. 15), and the paralytic twisting, Luke xiii. 11 (comp. ver. 13, and with it § 23, *a*),—nay, Luke iv. 39, the power of disease generally seems to be regarded as something daemonic. The daemons that were driven out of the man went, according to Luke viii. 31, into the abyss (comp. § 133, *d*, footnote 9). Daemonic possession, according to the analogy of the possession of the Spirit, is set forth as an *ἴχειν πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον* (Mark iii. 30; Luke viii. 27; comp. Mark iv. 33: *ἴχων πνεῦμα δαιμονίου ἀκαθάρτου*), or as *εἶναι ἐν πνεύματι ἀκαθάρτῳ* (Mark i. 23, v. 2; comp. xii. 36). In the Acts of the Apostles, too, *πνεύματα ἀκάθαρτα* occur (v. 16, viii. 7; comp. xix. 12–16: *πνεύματα πονηρά*),—in particular, a *πνεῦμα πύθωνος* (xvi. 16, 18).

forward faith as the condition of salvation, yet faith seldom appears as the saving trust in the specific Pauline sense (*b*). His way, too, of dealing with grace and the future salvation often reminds of the Pauline, without in any way bringing the Pauline form of doctrine sharply and exclusively forward (*c*). So strongly does he emphasize the work of the Spirit, yet the Spirit appears only as the principle of evangelical preaching and of Church government, of gifts of the Spirit and of prophecy, but not in the specifically Pauline sense as the principle of the new life (*d*).

(*a*) That Luke is, and wishes to be regarded as, a follower of Paul he shows, independently of the fact that it comes out from the whole plan of the Acts of the Apostles (§ 137, *c*, *d*), in this way, that in his account of the Lord's Supper he combines the Pauline (1 Cor. xi.) with that in the Gospel of Mark (Luke xxii. 19, 20). Truly Pauline is the preference, with which he selects parables which set forth God's love to sinners (chap. xv.), and the undeservedness of men (xvii. 7–10), or narratives like the favour shown to the malefactor (xxiii. 39–43), and the preference of that listening with an anxious desire for salvation from a weariness of one's own service (x. 38–42). But to this belongs also the way in which he brings forward the forgiveness of sins as the specific saving blessing (Acts xiii. 38, xxii. 16, xxvi. 18; comp. x. 43; Luke i. 77, iv. 19, vii. 47, 48, xxiv. 47). Notwithstanding, the rejected self-justification xvi. 15 is not the self-righteousness against which Paul contended, but the getting the glory of righteousness before men by works apparently holy; and if, too, the hearing of prayer for grace to the sinner is designated in the true Pauline way as justification (xviii. 14), yet the author shows by his addition, taken from the parable xiv. 11, that he regards penitent self-abasement, in opposition to the self-exaltation arising from pride of virtue on the part of the Pharisee (xviii. 9), as the ground of this justification, and not trust in the grace of God. But in the single passage where Luke makes the apostle quite on purpose declare his doctrine of justification (Acts xiii. 38), justification is, to be sure, put quite in the Pauline way as identical with the forgiveness of sins (ver. 39) obtained by Christ; but it is only thought of not at all in the Pauline way, as supplementary to the

forgiveness possible by the law, which, to be sure, appears according to the context as partly purification.[1]

(*b*) By an addition to the parallel passage in Mark, Luke viii. 12, 13 sets forth faith as the means of salvation, and he likewise adds, vii. 50, xvii. 19, to his narrative the words ἡ πίστις σου σέσωκέν σε, words which originally had a different tendency. Faith or believing, in the Acts of the Apostles, ordinarily appears simply as the mark of the Christian (comp. πιστεύειν: ii. 44, iv. 4, 32, v. 14, xi. 21, xv. 5, xvii. 12, 34, xviii. 27, xix. 2, 18, xx. 25; πίστις: vi. 5, 7, xi. 24, xiii. 8, xiv. 22, 27, xvi. 5; πιστός: x. 45, xvi. 1), but commonly in such close connection with the hearing of the word (xiii. 12, 48, xiv. 1, xvii. 12, xviii. 8), that confident persuasion of the truth of that word is plainly meant; in consequence, the word preached is taken as the word of God (xi. 1, xvii. 11; comp. Luke viii. 13; Acts viii. 14, and therewith § 40, *c*).[2] The contents of this word is the glad message of the Messiahship of Jesus, and of the salvation given in Him. If faith then refers to these contents, then it is a conviction of the Messiahship of Jesus (xvii. 31; comp. Luke xviii. 8, xxii. 32, xxiv. 25), with which then, to be sure, the point of the trust

[1] It is in connection with this, that Luke, deviating from Paul (§ 65, *b*), feels no scruple in taking such passages from his Jewish-Christian sources, when even pre-Christian piety is designated as δικαιοσύνη (Luke i. 6, ii. 25; Acts x. 22, 35); nay, he designates even Joseph of Arimathea as an ἀνὴρ ἀγαθὸς καὶ δίκαιος (Luke xxiii. 50). On the other hand, those passages where mention is made in the apostolic sources of the προφῆται καὶ δίκαιοι of the Old Testament he has partly changed (x. 24, xi. 47, 50, 51) and partly omitted (comp. Matt. x. 41). Yet comp. the frequent allusion to the Epistles of Paul, Luke xxi. 34; comp. 1 Thess. v. 3 f., xviii. 1; comp. 2 Thess. i. 11, xx. 38; comp. Rom. xiv. 7, 8, x. 8; comp. 1 Cor. x. 27, xii. 35; comp. Eph. vi. 14, xxi. 36; comp. Eph. vi. 18, x. 7; comp. 1 Tim. v. 18; Acts xx. 32; comp. Eph. i. 18.

[2] As, xxiv. 14, xxvi. 27, it is faith on the word of Scripture and on the prophets that is spoken of, so, Luke i. 20, 45, it is faith in God's message, and, Acts ix. 26, xiii. 41, conviction of the truth of a fact is called πιστεύειν. If a heathen believe in God (xvi. 34, πεπιστευκὼς τῷ θεῷ), then he begins to be persuaded of his existence. The word which the apostles proclaim is called here, as by Paul (§ 89, *a*), the word simply (ὁ λόγος: vi. 4, viii. 4, x. 44, xi. 19, xiv. 25, xvi. 6, xvii. 11, xviii. 5, xix. 20; comp. Luke i. 2), or the word of God (ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ, iv. 31, vi. 2, 7, viii. 14, xi. 1, xii. 24, xiii. 5, 7, 46, xvii. 13, xviii. 11, or τοῦ κυρίου: viii. 25, xiii. 44, 48, 49, xv. 35, 36, xvi. 32, xix. 10; comp. ἡ διδαχὴ τοῦ κυρίου, xiii. 12), like the word which Jesus has preached (Luke v. 1, viii. 11, 21, xi. 28), and the word of the Old Testament revelation of God (Acts vii. 38, λόγια; comp. Rom. iii. 2).

is easily directed to the salvation brought by it.[3] But not once, Acts xiii. 39, is the faith which conditions justification put in express relation to the person or the work of Christ. The *ὑπακούειν τῇ πίστει* is quite Pauline (vi. 7; comp. § 82, *d*), and so also is the calling on the name of Christ (ix. 14, 21, 22, 16; comp. § 76, *b*). On the other hand, once at least is the way of God (xviii. 25, 26), or the way simply (ix. 2, xix. 9, 23, xxii. 4, xxiv. 14, 22) which Christianity teaches, designated as walking in the fear of the Lord (ix. 31), by which it is put as identical with pre-Christian piety (x. 2, xxii. 35, xiii. 16, 26; comp. Luke i. 50, xviii. 2, 4, xxiii. 40), as it frequently is in the early apostolic writings.

(*c*) When the grace of God constitutes the substance of the message of salvation (xiv. 3, xx. 24, 32), it is plainly thought of quite in the Pauline way (§ 75, *c*) as the principle of salvation; and likewise, when the exhortation is given to continue in the grace of God (xiii. 43), inasmuch as grace conditions every result of the preaching of salvation (xi. 23, xiv. 26, xv. 40, xviii. 27).[4] Yet it may be the Lord Him-

[3] Apostolic preaching is here, too, according to its contents, called the glad message (*εὐαγγέλιον*: Acts xv. 7, xx. 24; *εὐαγγελίζεσθαι*: viii. 4, 25, 40, x. 36, xiv. 7, 21, xv. 35, xvi. 10; comp. Luke iii. 18, ix. 6, xx. 1), and that about the kingdom of God (Acts viii. 12; comp. xix. 8, xx. 25, xxviii. 23, 31), as Christ has proclaimed it (Luke iv. 43, viii. 1; Acts i. 3). But its special kernel consists in this, that Jesus as the Messiah has founded the kingdom of God; it is therefore a glad message about Jesus (viii. 35, xi. 20, xvii. 18; comp. xix. 13); and that about His Messiahship (v. 42, viii. 5, ix. 20, x. 42; comp. viii. 12, xvii. 13, xviii. 28, xxiii. 11, xxviii. 23, 31). As this is the foundation of all evangelical preaching, so may it also be regarded as a teaching (*διδάσκειν*: iv. 18, v. 28) or a speaking (*λαλεῖν*: iv. 17, v. 20; comp. xiv. 3: *παῤῥησιάζεσθαι*) on the ground (*ἐπί* or *ἐν*: ix. 27, 28) of His name, who designates Him as the Messiah. Sometimes along with the person of Jesus His resurrection is mentioned (xvii. 18), or instead of it the promise fulfilled in Him (xiii. 32; comp. xxvi. 6), as the contents of the glad message, xiv. 15, even the demand to repent (comp. xx. 21, xxvi. 20; Luke xxiv. 47). But the reference of faith to Christ is expressed sometimes by the dative (xviii. 8; comp. xvi. 15), sometimes by *εἰς* with the accusative (x. 43, xiv. 23, xix. 4, xx. 21, xxiv. 24; comp. Matt. xviii. 6), and faith appears in this conception, xxvi. 18, as the condition of salvation. Only in union with *εἰς* with the accusative (ix. 42, xi. 17, xvi. 31, xxii. 19; comp. Matt. xxvii. 42) does the element of confident trust appear to come into prominence, although, xxvii. 25, *πιστεύειν τῷ Θεῷ* stands for confidence in God, and, xiv. 9, *πίστις* for confidence in the salvation to be realized.

[4] But grace appears as the principle of the gifts of grace, such as wisdom,

self, too, who stands helpfully by the preachers of the gospel (xi. 21, xiv. 27, xviii. 10), and so adds to the Church[5] those (ii. 27) who, according to His predestination, are saved (§ 88), because they have been ordained to everlasting life (xiii. 48), in that He opens their hearts (xvi. 14). But as is the beginning, so also is the fruitful development of the Christian life in the individual, as in the Church (*οἰκοδομεῖσθαι*: ix. 31, xx. 32; comp. § 92, *b*), dependent on the working of God's grace, and hence needs prayer to Him.[6] The sum of all salvation is here, too, the Messianic deliverance, which is indeed designated, Matt. i. 21, as a deliverance of the people from their sins (Acts xiii. 26: *ὁ λόγος τῆς σωτηρίας*; xvi. 17: *ὁδὸς σωτηρίας*; comp. Luke i. 69, 71, 77, xix. 9; Acts xvi. 30, 31: *οἱ σωζόμενοι*; comp. Luke xiii. 23, viii. 12, vii. 50, xvii. 19, xix. 10; Acts xxviii. 28: *τὸ σωτήριον τοῦ Θεοῦ*; comp. Luke ii. 30, iii. 6), and the mediator of it is Christ (Acts xiii. 23; comp. Luke ii. 11). It is quite Pauline if in the setting of the statements, Luke vi. 35, xx. 36, the sons of God are thought of as perfected only in the future world (comp. § 97, *c*, and even Matt. v. 9), as then also, Acts xx. 32 (comp. xxvi. 18), is the *κληρονομία* promised, or if participa-

miraculous power (vi. 8, vii. 10), and the word *χάρισμα* does not occur at all in the Acts of the Apostles. This usage reminds one of the prevailing usage in Peter (§ 45, *b*, footnote 3); so the Old Testament *εὑρίσκειν χάριν* occurs in Luke (vii. 46; comp. Luke i. 30), and in connection therewith *χάρις* is used for the good pleasure which one finds with God or men (Luke ii. 40, 52, iv. 22; comp. Luke vi. 32–34); Acts xxiv. 27, xxv. 3, 9, it designates a human favour.

[5] The word *ἐκκλησία* occurs here and v. 11, viii. 1, 3, and oftener, of single churches, but only in ix. 31 the more comprehensive sense, in which Christ by His own blood has acquired the Church to be His own possession (xx. 28: *ἡ ἐκκλησία τοῦ κυρίου*). Her members are those who have turned to God (*ἐπιστρέφειν ἐπὶ τὸν Θεόν*: xiv. 15, xv. 19, xxiv. 18, 20, or *ἐπὶ τὸν κύριον* in the same sense, ix. 35, xi. 21), or are added to the Lord (*i.e.* Christ, v. 14, xi. 24; comp. xi. 23). They are called sometimes, as in the Gospels, *μαθηταί* (vi. 1, 2, about thirty times), *scil.* *τοῦ κυρίου* (ix. 1); sometimes, as in the apostolic Epistles, *ἀδελφοί* (i. 15, vi. 3, about thirty-four times); seldomer *οἱ ἅγιοι* (ix. 32, 41, xxvi. 10; comp. ix. 13: *οἱ ἅγιοι τοῦ Χριστοῦ*; xx. 32, xxvi. 18: *ἡγιασμένοι*).

[6] As Luke often makes it prominent that Christ prayed (Luke iii. 21, v. 16, vi. 12, ix. 18, 28, 29, xi. 1), and records abundantly His exhortations to prayer (comp. especially xi. 5–8, xviii. 1 ff., xxi. 36), so he praises also the zeal for prayer in the apostles and in the Church (i. 14, 24, ii. 42, iv. 31, vi. 4, 6, viii. 15, x. 9, xi. 5, xii. 5, 12, xvi. 25, xx. 36, xxi. 5, xxii. 17; comp. x. 2, 4, 30, 31), and sometimes also the fasts connected therewith (xiii. 2, 3, xiv. 23; comp. x. 30).

tion in the resurrection (Luke xiv. 14) or in the future world (xx. 35), and fellowship with the exalted Christ (xxi. 36), are confined to the believers or the righteous (comp. § 99, *b*).[7]

(*d*) The importance, which in the writings of Luke is laid on the activity of the Spirit, seems to. be quite Pauline.[8] It is more strongly stated even of Jesus than in the oldest tradition (§ 18), that He acted and spoke in the power of the Spirit (Luke iv. 14, 18; Acts i. 2), as is also the fulness of the Spirit given to His forerunner (Luke i. 15, 17) and to those who prophesied of Him (i. 41, 67, ii. 25, 27) specially emphasized. In Jesus' speech, the promise xi. 13 is referred specially to prayer for the Holy Spirit, and the word about blaspheming the Spirit is referred to the Spirit speaking in the apostles (xii. 10–12). But, above all, it is repeatedly recorded how the Risen One had assured the disciples of the Spirit promised by His Father (Luke xxiv. 49), as the power from on high with which they should be clothed (Acts i. 4, 5, 8, xi. 16).[9] The promise was fulfilled at Pente-

[7] With this is connected the change on the saying, Luke xii. 5 (comp. Matt. x. 28, and therewith § 34, *d*, footnote 8), by which the idea is expressly excluded that the godless will be thrown *body and soul* into hell. All the more striking is it if, Acts xxiv. 15, a resurrection of the just *and* of the unjust is spoken of,—a statement which can be taken only in the sense of the Apocalypse (§ 132, *b*). Quite Pauline is the idea of a direct fellowship with Christ, to whom believers come at death (Luke xxiii. 43; Acts vii. 59; comp. § 96, *d*). But the πνεῦμα in the latter passage is as little as in xvii. 16, xix. 21, the higher Christian spiritual life in the sense of § 86, *b*; and since Luke does not at all know the Pauline idea of the σάρξ, and indicates but the early Christian psychological ideas, then only the human spiritual life is to be thought of even in xviii. 25, xx. 22, although there it is evidently guided by the Holy Spirit.

[8] This is made prominent even in the first Gospel, if the command to baptize (Matt. xxviii. 19), which the exalted Christ gave to His disciples when He appeared to them, means that they are to baptize in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. Moreover, it can scarcely be thereby originally intended to give a wider baptismal formula in contradistinction to that of the first apostles (§ 41, *a*, footnote 1). Rather along with the reference to Him who is confessed as the Son of the Father, *i.e.* as the Messiah, the reference to the Spirit is only made prominent, as participation in the Spirit is promised in baptism.

[9] It is clear from Luke xxiv. 49, Acts i. 8, that the Spirit, just as by Paul (§ 84, *a*, footnote 4), is thought of as a divine power (comp. Luke iv. 14), as elsewhere also this power seems to be connected with the Spirit (Luke i. 17; Acts x. 38), or to be but another term for it (Luke i. 35, v. 17; Acts iv. 33, vi. 8).

cost in the first place, where, as the principle of the gifts of grace, He wrought that speaking with other tongues, which is described by Luke as miraculous speech (ii. 4–11), as later the speaking with tongues and prophesying for the first converted Gentiles (x. 44–46) and for the converted disciples of John (xix. 6). As now the Holy Spirit speaks in Old Testament prophecy (i. 16, iv. 25, xxviii. 25), so also does He in New Testament preaching (vii. 51), which is indeed a word of God, according to note *b*, as was the former. In conformity with Christ's promise (Luke xii. 12), the apostles were filled with the Holy Spirit for their defence before the Sanhedrim (Acts iv. 8); but so, too, were all believers equipped by repeated outpourings of the Spirit for bold preaching in the presence of threatening persecution (iv. 31; comp. ix. 31, xiii. 52). The Spirit strengthens faith in them (vi. 5, xi. 24), and communicates the wisdom to them (vi. 3, 10), which they require for preaching. He also gives to them the manifold special indications as to what they have to do for the discharge of their missionary calling (viii. 29, 39, x. 19, xi. 12, xiii. 2, 4, xvi. 6, 7), or for the advance of the life of the Church (xx. 28; comp. xv. 28, v. 3, 9). But here, too, he appears (comp. § 135, *d*) as the organ of prophecy in the narrower sense (xi. 28, xiii. 9, xx. 23, xxi. 4, 11; comp. vii. 55); but never, on the other hand, in the specific Pauline sense as the principle of the new spiritual life. Here, therefore, it is also clear that Luke, in spite of all allusions to Paulinism, has not reproduced the specific peculiarity of the Pauline method of doctrine.[10]

[10] If from this we see how difficult it was even for the immediate disciples of the apostle to comprehend the peculiarity of his doctrine in its essential points, for the same thing the Epistle of the Romish Clement furnishes a second highly instructive example, then this is of great importance for the criticism of the Pastoral Epistles, in which the fundamental type of Paul's method of doctrine is preserved so thoroughly pure and full (comp. § 108).

PART FIFTH.

THE JOHANNEAN THEOLOGY.

INTRODUCTION.

§ 140. *The Sources of the Johannean Theology.*

THE sources of the Johannean theology are the Fourth Gospel and the three Epistles of John (*a*). The Biblical-theological realization of the Gospel is by no means conditioned by the denial of its historical trustworthiness (*b*). A sharp distinction between the substance of Jesus' speeches proceeding from a true remembrance, and their Johannean conception and setting, is neither possible nor necessary (*c*). Yet Biblical theology has in many ways to separate in detail between what John expressly gives as the doctrines of the Master, and what has been drawn therefrom by individual independent doctrinal conception (*d*).

(*a*) From the sources of the Johannean theology, as it is to be presented in this section, the Apocalypse is entirely excluded.[1] There remain for us, therefore, only the Gospel and

[1] Its author was distinct from him from whom the Gospel and the Epistles came; his doctrinal views and method were in many ways different. Thus far will criticism ever be in the right, even should it turn out that it is the same Apostle John who, in the at least two decenniums which he had survived the fall of Jerusalem, epochs full of importance in the development of the Church, by the inclusion of Greek Gentile Christians, had in many ways become so different. Even for the decision of this critical question, Biblical theology, while it points steadily in its representation to what is related in the older doctrinal ideas, but sets forth at the same time the doctrinal peculiarities of the Gospel and of the Epistles in these complete particulars, will be able to be fruitful, inasmuch as it will be clear from it whether the points of contact for the doctrinal development here presented are to be found in the Apocalypse or not.

the Epistles, the time of whose composition cannot be fixed with complete certainty, both of which, however, become more intelligible the farther they are pushed back towards the end of the first century. In this fixing of the time, which is vouched for by external testimony for the Gospel, as also by undeniable traces of personal knowledge in it, Biblical theology has more interest than in the question, whether the Gospel came direct from the apostle, or, by which many problems connected with it seem to be more easily solved, only arose from communications by him. But since the testimony of the Gospel itself, which at this time, and in its preponderatingly indirect way, can be no literary invention, excludes the latter supposition, we believe the direct apostolicity of it must be firmly maintained. That the Gospel and the Epistles proceed from the same hand must be regarded as made out. It has no doubt been attempted to ascribe the second and third Epistles to a different author from the first (comp. Ebrard in Olshausen's *bibl. Comment.* vi. 4, Königsberg 1859; and, on the other hand, Weiss' *theol. Literaturblatt*, 1880, Nr. 18); but the grounds needful to make this valid can as little hinder us from classing them with the first, as the little which the second in particular contains of doctrinal matter agrees thoroughly, confessedly, with that of the first both in substance and expression. The Gospel even and the first Epistle were no doubt assigned by the Tübingen school to different authors. But, from the striking agreement of both writings in doctrinal terms and contents, the one must have intentionally copied the other, and the dispute on this point carried on between Baur (*theol. Jahrb.* 1848, 3) and Hilgenfeld (*das Evangelium u. die Briefe Johannis*, Halle 1849), as to which was the original, shows sufficiently that neither of them in any very evident way bears the marks of an imitation (comp. Grimm, *Stud. u. Krit.* 1847, 1; 1849, 2).

(*b*) The Biblical theological realization of the Fourth Gospel appears only in the first place then unquestionable, if with the Tübingen school it is ascribed to a Gentile Christian of the second century, who has given in it no real history, but a literary redaction of the synoptical tradition, freely moulded according to his doctrinal point of view, mixed with quite independent invention, and in the speeches of Christ essentially only the

development of his own theology (comp. Baur, *kritische Untersuchungen über die kanonischen Evangelien*, Tübingen 1847). If, on the other hand, the author is held to be the Apostle John, and the contents of the Gospel to be an essentially trustworthy historical representation, then its value as an original writing for Johannean theology seems to be very narrowly limited, while only the Prologue of the Gospel and individual incidental expressions, in which the author comes forward in a self-reflecting way, can be held as valid expressions of that theology. But, according to the analogy of § 114, *c*, the doctrinal point of view becoming specially prominent in John, remains in any case of standard significance for the doctrinal views of the author, from which point of view the materials dealt with by him are selected, grouped, and presented. But even the speeches of Christ in the Gospel may, even if they are conceived to be verbally authentic, not be excluded from being sources for the Johannean theology, since an imperfect representation of it must remain, unless we go back to the living words of the Lord in the recollection of the apostle, from which their education had resulted, to assure the full understanding of which, and to develop their depths, must always have been for the disciples the most important task.

(*c*) If the evangelist passes directly at times from communicating the words of Jesus to explanations of his own (iii. 19–21), or joins utterances of Jesus independently with a whole, which has for him the value of his own reflections, it is clear from this, that he was conscious to himself that he had reproduced the speeches of Jesus not in verbal accuracy, but by a free reproduction conformable to the laws of memory, which must, moreover, at any rate be assumed, considering the length of time after which he wrote all down. That this now really took place, is confirmed by the undeniable uniformity between the doctrinal terms and the development of thought in the Epistles, and the speeches and dialogues in the Gospel.[2] But we therewith lose any certain rule for a

[2] The common expedient, that the beloved disciple had most completely appropriated the manner of the Master's thoughts and doctrines, is wrecked on the undeniable fact of the difference, which appears so sharply both in form and contents, which Christ's speeches show in the synoptical Gospels, resting as

complete separation between what was to the evangelist a given portion of his remembrance of the speeches of Jesus, and what was his own spiritual property. The evangelist was conscious to himself, that much of what Jesus had said first gradually emerged in the remembrance of the disciples in consequence of the working of the Spirit (xiv. 26; comp. ii. 22), and thus many historical remembrances could only come late to be effectual for the development of apostolic doctrine. But he also admits that the Spirit, who carried forward the work of Jesus (xiv. 26, xvi. 13), had taught them much, which Jesus, from paedogogic reasons, could not yet communicate to them, which yet was taken from those treasures which Jesus already possessed (vv. 14, 15). In point of doctrinal significance there was therefore for the evangelist no distinction between what Jesus had taught directly, and what we now regard as His spiritual possession, because the Spirit only taught him it. Much which had come directly from Jesus' mouth, and which the Spirit had helped him to reach by a deeper understanding and richer development of the truth contained in his words, must have become mixed up in his remembrance. But only in the form in which he wrote down Christ's speeches in his Gospel did he hold them in his memory; hence only in that conception and representation could they form the foundation for his view of doctrine at the time.[8]

(*d*) In spite of the apparent freedom with which the speeches of Christ in our Gospel are reproduced in the spirit and in the speech of the evangelist, there are yet those

these equally do on apostolic tradition, as also on this, that that accordance extends even to the speeches of the Baptist, and even, incidentally, to those of the disciples.

[8] Historical criticism may ask, How much in those words can yet be proved as a real historical kernel? Biblical theology must abide by this, that all which Jesus had spoken, according to the remembrance of the evangelist, in the setting in which he has preserved it, was authoritative for him, and must therefore be regarded as a portion of his theology. What is true of Christ's speeches is true in a certain sense of the narrative portions of the Gospel. What John gives of reminiscences from the life of Jesus is, since he selects his materials, evidently according to doctrinal points of view, naturally all of it, and quite in the form in which he presents it, authoritative for his idea of Christ. The question, how far this reminiscence is one unconditionally authentic, belongs to historical criticism, and has no interest for Bible theology.

elements in them, which have not become more widely operative in the special development of the Johannean theology, but which stand apart, and, on that very account, testify to the firm kernel of historical reminiscences which is contained in them. Just so is it shown, on the other hand, that ideas and doctrines, which are throughout familiar to the evangelist, are found in the speeches of Christ not at all or quite isolated, and these bear, on that account, in the strongest way the individual Johannean mark. But both considerations show that the evangelist, as a matter of fact, though not perhaps with a clear consciousness, yet distinguished in details between the first principles given in the words of Jesus in his memory, and his own views of doctrine, which had been built thereon. This is especially the case in the doctrine of Jesus' person, in so far as it forms the central-point of the whole Johannean theology, and, at the same time, the principal theme of the speeches of Christ in the Gospel, so that we can yet here mostly distinguish between the fundamental principles given in these speeches and the specifically Johannean further development. But we shall have to prove elsewhere, on the one hand, that individual doctrinal elements recorded by him from memory have not been perfectly assimilated even by himself, or not independently realized; and, on the other, that individual doctrinal developments of his find no point of attachment in his reminiscences of the speeches of Christ. So far, accordingly, as the form of the doctrines of Jesus rises on the background of the Johannean theology, it seems, from its shape in the oldest tradition, from which our view springs, to be here the final result of Biblical theology in the deepest conception and the highest glory, which they found in the spirit of the disciple whom Jesus had loved.

§ 141. *The Character of the Johannean Theology.*

As John, according to the course of his development, could not conceive of Christianity in opposition to Old Testament Judaism, and yet had seen it in its complete emancipation from its Jewish-Christian sources, so Jewish-Christian doctrinal elements, quite irreconciled, had become mingled in his doctrinal method with what was to him the most special

expression of the simply new in Christianity (*a*). The fundamental principles of his theology form a view of the person of Christ and of its saving significance most quickening, in which the apostle has by contemplation sunk ever deeper (*b*). His idealism lets this Son of Thunder see *à priori* throughout the deepest essence in the outward form, the immutable law in the changeful actuality, the final consummation in the germinal beginning (*c*). The aim after a single central-point of all spiritual life gives a mystical character to his method of doctrine, and makes him the apostle of love, in which all knowledge becomes life (*d*).

(*a*) The Apostle John had passed through the school of the Baptist, and of his own accord he turned to Jesus, whose disciple he became (i. 35–40). More even than to the other apostles had the transition from the old to the new been brought about slowly to him, which prevented violent crises, and a break with his religious past. Only he, who holds Christ's speeches in the Gospel to be free developments of Johannean theology, can in its polemic, a polemic which was conditioned by the historical situation, and was directed, therefore, against unbelieving and hostile Judaism, find an antithesis of the author against Judaism in itself (comp. Köstlin, pp. 40, 41). To be sure, the Johannean writings belong, according to § 140, *a*, to a time when the Church, after the fall of Jerusalem, had already become strange to her own Jewish-Christian past, and the author, who for a decennium had wrought in a Gentile-Christian district, and had already become separated from religious and national fellowship with his fellow-countrymen, looked upon the Jewish people, which had for long put themselves in whole and in part into hostile opposition to Christianity, as though this people had never been his fellows. The new, which he found in Christianity, had he in the richest and profoundest way expressed in a general human way, for which he himself scarcely needed any more to lean on the Old Testament. But nowhere, on that account, is there shown any breach with Old Testament fundamental views and traditions, as Frommann has thought he has perhaps found in him. His doctrinal views are even by that means characterized *à priori* as early apostolic; that the law and prophecy of the Old Testament appear to him as the

positive preparation and transition to Christianity; nay, that the pre-Christian revelation of God in its method and working is often quite strikingly paralleled by the perfect revelation of God in Christ. Hence Old Testament ideas, and early apostolic ideas grounded thereupon, emerge in almost all the doctrinal parts, and often cross the independently-formed new circle of ideas. No doubt, nothing ought to be said of any atoning element in John's view of doctrine, as Neander, p. 913, and Messner, p. 322, do. The author is not conscious of any antagonism between this circle of Old Testament ideas, and that specially formed by himself. In the naïvest way he unites them, perhaps, without requiring any means of openly proclaimed reconciliation. Just because Old Testament Judaism and Christianity are not contrasts to him, but the former is but the divinely-appointed preparatory step to the latter, the ideas springing from the latter never appear to him to be in contradiction to its peculiar circle of ideas.

(*b*) As one of the disciples, who had been constantly in Jesus' fellowship from His very first appearance, as one of the three confidential disciples (Mark v. 37, ix. 2, xiii. 3, xiv. 33), as he whom Jesus had counted worthy of a special love (John xiii. 23, xx. 2; comp. xxi. 20), John must have felt himself arrested by the person of Jesus, even more directly and more powerfully than the other disciples, and must have been determined by it in his entire spiritual life. How this came about, depended on his spiritual individuality. As we come to know this individuality from the Acts of the Apostles, John, who throughout yielded to Peter, although evidently bound to him by the closest ties (Acts iii. 1, 3, 11, viii. 14), was no energetically pushing nature, laying itself out for practical action. As he appears in his Epistles, he was intuitional, contemplative. Neither is the aid of reflective thinking any necessity to him, not even where various lines of thought cross before him (note *a*), by which the means are so easily offered him; nor does he show any inclination for speculation proper, though that has often been sought in him. His whole spiritual work is a contemplative sinking of himself in a small circle of great truths, which unveil ever new sides to him, disclose ever new depths in them, present the same object in ever new lights. If we think of this contemplative nature

brought face to face with Jesus, then it could not be any one thing Jesus taught or brought or promised, but only His person itself, which seized his spiritual life, and concentrated on itself his undivided regard. To sink himself ever deeper into its whole height and significance; to seek and find in it on all sides the highest salvation; to become ever more sure and more joyful in the ever more complete surrender to this possession, must have been the goal of all his spiritual struggles and life. Thus the whole view of Jesus' person, so full of life, and the saving significance of it, grew on him, which, as it had been found not in the way of reflective thought or *à priori* speculation, but only by living intuition and contemplation, became the animating and blissful centre of his whole spiritual life. This complete view of the person of Christ and of its saving significance forms, therefore, the starting-point of his whole doctrinal views. Therein rests what may be called the Gnostic character of John's theology. This Gnosis has nothing in common with the speculative impulse, or with the dialectic skill of Paul (§ 58, *a*). It is a knowing immediately, a living looking on the highest revelation of God, given in and with the person of Christ, an ever new sinking of himself in fathomless depths of that revelation which had been manifested in Christ.

(*c*) A fruit of this contemplation, as it corresponded to the spiritual individuality of the apostle, we find in the great comprehensive first principles which are peculiar to the Johannean theology. They are not abstract ideas got from reflection, but forms of intuitive perception, in which the highest things, about which his spiritual life was occupied, ever afresh presented themselves to his regard. In these, the simple innermost being of things was presented to him; the external appearances, on the other hand, with their changeful manifoldness, as the accidental and the unessential, lost their significance. And therefore he sees throughout the comprehensive contrasts of God and the devil, light and darkness, truth and falsehood, love and hatred, which trace all phenomena back to their deepest reason, their ultimate principle. And therefore he announces so generally, what is the norm in the deepest nature of things, untroubled by the thought how many exceptions and deviations may occur in empirical

experience. On this account, one side of a thing, by which his attention was arrested, is brought by him prominently forward with an exclusiveness, so that the accidental setting forth of the other side is made thereby to appear as the sharpest self-contradiction. On that account, he finally takes no apparent notice of the different stages of development, because in each case he looks on the essence of the thing which is realized in it in certain mass and degree. Truth is truth, whether it be the imperfect Old Testament truth or the eternal perfect New Testament truth. Faith is faith; knowledge is knowledge, from its germinal beginnings to its fullest completeness. Life is eternal life even in this world. This may be called the idealism of John's view of doctrine, because in the concrete reality he sees, in general, only the idea which is realized therein, and which struggles thereby after the comprehension of the highest. This idealism is the glorified form of the fiery spirit, which Jesus characterized in the sons of Zebedee by the name Sons of Thunder (Mark iii. 17), of the impatience which would not acknowledge any other fellowship with Jesus, than the complete self-surrender of the disciples (ix. 38), of that high striving ambition by which the highest was purchased not too dearly by what is most difficult (x. 37–39). It is at this point shown that the beloved disciple of the Gospel is at last but the more completely developed form of the author of the Apocalypse, who had described the world-historical victory of Christianity as the great drama of the last struggle of God with Satan (§ 133, *d*).

(*d*) The perception of intuition and contemplation, as we have described them note *b*, is very suggestive; it comprehends and determines the whole man, because the object thereby is not in general apprehended in the divided territory of intellectual life, but in the centre of the spiritual life. On this standpoint there can be no contrast between the theoretical and the practical, between knowing and doing, between faith and life. John does not know of this contrast, and he will not acknowledge it; to him, even the revelation of the law has never stirred any discord between knowing and willing; for him there is but a knowledge of the full revelation of God in Christ, which brings about as its result the doing of what

is good. What the spiritual life has not comprehended in its simple central-point, it has not known; intuitive knowledge is such a laying hold of the object, as includes a being laid hold by it in the innermost being. The knowledge of God and Christ is a being in God and Christ, and a being of God and Christ in us. That is the Johannean mysticism, which does not consist in a soaring in indefinite and confused views and feelings, but in an effort to get at the one central-point of the spiritual life, in which everything which is to have real value is traced back to the deepest foundation of the being to the personal life itself, which, moreover, finds as the religious element its deepest satisfaction in the direct relation of person to person. This mysticism is begotten of the innermost need of the emotional life, is comprehended in feeling and self-surrender, in finding in love the foundation and the object and the goal of all living and life-giving knowledge. Thus John, with all in whom love to God has been quickened, has found in Christ the full revelation of the love of God. In this sense he may be called the apostle of love. Only by that, on the other hand, there must not be understood a weak feeling, a sentimental impulse, but the energy of such a surrender of the whole person as knows of no third thing between love and hate, and which on that account is but the glorified form of a fiery spirit from another side, who once wished to have fire rained from heaven on one who refused his love to the Lord (Luke ix. 54), and who solemnizes the righteous judgment of God over the anti-christian world.

§ 142. *Previous Works on John.*

The representations of the Johannean doctrinal system in the earlier works of Biblical theology, partly in consequence of false presuppositions as to the sources of that system, have turned out mostly to be somewhat poor (*a*). The independent representations of Frommann, Köstlin, and Hilgenfeld have dealt with it too much in the sense of a dogmatic or philosophical system (*b*). Hitherto Reuss, Baur, and Scholten have justified its peculiarity, although they have in principle mistaken essential sides of it (*c*). Only on the ground of a

thoroughgoing analysis of the Johannean fundamental ideas, and a juster appreciation of the Old Testament elements of its theology, as also along with a consideration of its relation to the living doctrines of his Master in the memory of the apostle, can it be set forth on all sides (*d*).

(*a*) Even for the representation of the Johannean doctrinal system, the discussion by Neander in particular (comp. ii. pp. 874–914 [E. T. ii. 1–58]) is to be put below the older works (comp. Bauer in his *biblischen Theologie*, Bd. ii.; E. Schmid, *Diss.* II. *de theologia Joannis Ap.*, Jena 1801). Neander has many deep glimpses into the peculiarity of the Johannean theology, but these are set forth neither fully nor with complete proof. His main effort is directed towards a harmonizing comparison of the Johannean with the Pauline doctrinal system, as also towards a clear exhibition of his relation to some dogmatic fundamental doctrines, by which the representation of the Johannean theology in its special connections is prejudiced. Schmid has made the attempt, quite unjustifiable, according to § 140, *c*, to set forth John's doctrines, excluding Christ's speeches in the Gospel, and therefore to keep only quite a poor imitation (ii. pp. 359–396); van Oosterzee has also lately followed him (§ 45). The representation of Messner has turned out to be (pp. 323–360) much richer, because he does not altogether at least exclude these speeches (comp. p. 320). Without doubt Lechler has made use of them as sources for the doctrinal system of John (comp. p. 206), which, after a discussion on the doctrine of God, of the world, and of the prince of the world, he has comprehended in the sentence, Jesus Christ, the Son of God, in whom is life (p. 207 f.). But the peculiar Johannean fundamental ideas are disproportionably less thorough in their discussion than by Messner. Finally, Lutterbeck, who has excellently established the use to be made of the speeches (ii. p. 254 f.), has dealt with the Johannean doctrine altogether according to the scheme of the dogmatic system (ii. pp. 252–299), by which its special type must necessarily be rubbed out.

(*b*) Frommann gave the first comprehensive representation of the Johannean theology in his *johanneischen Lehrbegriff* (Leipsic 1839). Although he excluded Christ's speeches in the Gospel from being special sources, he yet found himself

compelled even to draw them in again for explanation and filling up. From his thoroughly misleading presupposition of the Johannean Gnosis (comp. § 141, *b*), that the apostle had risen to a freer speculation as to the grounds and nature of Christianity (p. 84), there is spun out of it a finely articulated system of speculative dogmatics, which seeks in him the solution of the deepest problems (*e.g.* as to the relation of God and the world, of freedom and necessity, pp. 137, 242), and attributes to him the sharpest distinctions (comp. *e.g.* pp. 210, 259, 266), and the most abstract definitions (comp. *e.g.* p. 165). Naturally the Johannean type of doctrine is thereby separated entirely from its historical foundations; it is torn away from its connection with the Old Testament and the Jewish consciousness (comp. *e.g.* pp. 288, 308, 329), and it comes necessarily to be but a spiritualistic shadow of the apostle's doctrine. In the comparisons of the Johannean with the other doctrinal systems much is sought for and sharply conceived, while the kernel of the Johannean peculiarity is not touched. The representation runs away on the lines of a tendency, which, with its abstract reasons for its sections, draws the apostle's doctrinal system *à priori* into a false light. The representation of K. R. Köstlin (*der Lehrbegriff des Evangeliums u. der Briefe Johannis*, Berlin 1843) is from the standpoint of the Tübingen school, which puts in the forefront as its central idea, that Christianity is the absolute religion, and that in contrast to Judaism and heathenism, and asserts that the apostle's dogmatics is at the same time throughout both apologetical and polemical (p. 40 f.). But the absolute religion is Christianity as a religion of the Gnosis, which to the evangelist is one with faith (p. 66 f.). Köstlin admits, to be sure, that the author does not philosophize; but all his conclusions in the form of direct knowledge, contemplation, he draws from his experience (p. 82), but only because systematic reflection on the dogma, and therewith intelligent activity, are thereby completed and brought to a firm result (p. 160). There is thus, then, here a doctrine of God imposed on His nature and His trinity in unity, which draws into the Johannean theology philosophical results altogether foreign to it. From similar presuppositions Schwegler in his *nachapostolischen Zeitalter* has characterized

the religious philosophical standpoint of the Gospel (ii. pp. 358–371). Hilgenfeld has also tried to class the Johannean system of doctrine in the development of the Gnosis, and he has therefore drawn from the Gospel a complete gnostic system occupying a middle place between Valentin and Marcion—a system with a fully pronounced dualism and anti-Judaism (comp. *das Evangelium u. die Briefe Johannis, nach ihrem Lehrbegriff dargestellt,* Halle 1849; *Zeitschrift f. Wiss. Theol.* 1863, 1, 2).[1]

(*c*) The general characterization of the Johannean theology by Reuss (ii. pp. 369–600 [E. T. ii. 331–543]) contains excellent suggestions as to its specific peculiarity. The arrangement of the representation of it, according to the leading ideas of a union of John iii. 16 and 1 John iv. 9, is a suggestive fancy, which cannot be carried through at least on his understanding of the Johannean doctrine. But the fundamental error of it consists, on the one hand, in this, that Reuss along with the historical assumes some speculative premises, which are to form the basis of the mystical contemplation of John; and, on the other hand, in this, that he understands the special Johannean doctrinal elements as much too modern and spiritualistic, and thereby puts it in sharp opposition to everything that is of the Old Testament or of Judaism. In consequence of this, he has at one time to assume that the author becomes entangled in contradictions to his speculative premises, and at another, that for practical use he appropriates popular ideas beyond which he has strictly gone. In this way, naturally, it is not possible to come to any uniform conception of the Johannean doctrinal peculiarities. Baur, in his *Biblical Theology* (pp. 351–407), represents the Johannean doctrinal system drawn from the Fourth Gospel simply as the highest stage and the most perfect form of the New Testament doctrinal type, a stage which presupposes all the others, includes them all in itself, and concludes them, which in like manner rises above Judaism and Paulinism (p. 401). Starting with the Logos-idea in the Prologue, taking

[1] Of the smaller representations, comp. Holm, *Versuch einer kurtzen Darstellung der Lehre des Apostels Johannes,* Lüneburg 1832; Simson, *summa theologiae Johanneae,* Königsberg 1839; Niese, *die Grundgedanken des johanneischen Evangeliums,* Naumburg 1850.

up the most important leading doctrines, he has discussed them to their natural results, and given many a deep glimpse into the peculiarity of the Johannean theology. But the Jewish-Christian element in it does not get justice done to it by him, and the supposition of an approach to Gnosticism, in which, however, he is far from going the length Hilgenfeld does, often misleads him, or makes him contented with inexplicit or contradictory results. The representation of J. H. Scholten (*das Evangelium nach Johannes, übersetzt von H. Lang*, Berlin 1867; comp. chap. iii. pp. 77–181) connects an interpretation agreeing in the main with Reuss, only, in contrast to him, the relation to Old Testament religion is more correctly appreciated, with an approach to the dualistic conception of Hilgenfeld, whose external hardness, however, is rubbed off, and it contains in clear representation much that is excellent along with gross blunders. Immer finds the main thought of the Gospel in the sentence, "Jesus, the Son of God, the light and life of the world," under which he appends by a strange selection and series the pretended secondary ideas of the Gospel (among which is the idea of faith!), and that of the Epistle in the sentence, "fellowship with God;" but he never comes to tangible and precise results as to the relation of the author to Judaism or to the other decisive questions (pp. 502–548).

(*d*) In my writing *der johanneische Lehrbegriff, in seinen Grundzügen untersucht*, Berlin 1862, I have tried to forward the understanding of Johannean theology in three directions. It appeared to me, in the first place, that a clearer determination of the fundamental ideas of John (§ 141, *c*) was necessary.[2] Then, in the former representations, justice had never been done to the Old Testament fundamental principles of the Johannean theology, — principles which are to be necessarily presupposed in any tracing back of it to the apostle (§ 141, *a*). Just so, the indication of the special

[2] By appealing to the mystical or intuitive character of John's method of thought, it has been thought justifiable in many ways to deny any exactness to these ideas, to regard them as in a nebulous twilight, or to give to them a width which left room for uniting or mixing the most heterogeneous. But just as intuitive forms of contemplation, they will have a plasticity which can be fixed by no logical definition, but by reference to the living significance they had for the apostle.

intermingling of these, with what expresses the individual Johannean conception of the salvation given in Christianity, must be the key for many a mystery in our system of doctrine. Finally, it seemed to me to be required, in the sense of § 140, *d*, to separate that which John gives from memory as his Master's self-testimony, from what he has therefrom doctrinally developed. It is enough now to sum up in one connected and complete image what was there secured by separate investigations. That is, starting, according to § 141, *b*, from the Christology (chap. i.), to set forth by natural order the salvation in Christ (chap. ii.), the conditions of its appropriation (chap. iii.), its historical realization (chap. iv.), and its consummation (chap. v.).[3]

CHAPTER I.

THE CHRISTOLOGY.

§ 143. *The Sending of the Only-begotten Son.*

Jesus has been sent as the only-begotten Son of the Father, and on this peculiar relation to the Father He grounds His claim for the Messianic character of His mission (*a*). As the Son of His love, the execution of the specifically Messianic works of God is entrusted to Him, and of these works His miracles are but signs (*b*). By them it is shown that the Father is in the Son, and works in Him as

[3] For the fuller establishment and exposition with different conceptions, I refer once for all to my book mentioned above. Yet I hope that many an individual point which was there brought forward, will find in the complete representation of the whole Johannean system of doctrine, and in its comparison with other types of doctrine, a deeper establishment, and will acquire a more conclusive evidence. The simple numbers of passages quoted in the following pages refer throughout to the Gospel of John; the Epistles are designated by I. II. III.; of individual helpful works, comp. also Grimm, *de joanneae christologiae indole paulinae comparata*, Lips. 1833; Schulze, *Vom Menschensohn u. vom Logos*, Gotha 1867; Nösgen, *Christus, der Menschen- und Gottessohn*, Gotha 1869; Weizsäcker, *in den Jahrb. für deutsche Theologie*, 1857, 1, 1862, 4; Luthardt, *Ἔργον τοῦ Θεοῦ und πίστις in ihrem gegenseitigen Verhältniss nach der Darstellung des joh. Evang.* (*Stud. u. Krit.* 1852, 2); Huther, *die Bedeutung der Begriffe ζωή und πιστεύειν in den joh. Schriften* (*Jahrb. f. d. Th.* 1871, 1); Zahn, *de notione peccati, quam Johannes in prima ep. docet*, Halis S. 1872.

the perfect organ of His working on earth, as the Son abides in the Father in the continual obedience of love (*c*). From both is exhibited the unity of the Son with the Father, in virtue of which the Son is the highest revelation of the Father (*d*).

(*a*) The self-testimony of Jesus with John, which, naturally in the form in which it lives in the momory of the evangelist, forms the basis of his idea of the person of Christ, arises, quite as the synoptical (§ 13, *c*) idea, from the fact that He has been sent by God (xvii. 3; comp. v. 38, vi. 29). This fact is the most important object of Christian faith and knowledge (xvii. 8, 21, 23, 25). But in everything which Jesus says on the point, it is ever again implied that in the truest and completest sense He has been sent out by God, that He fulfils all the duties, and can claim all the rights, of one so sent.[1] He, no doubt, seems to class Himself only among the prophets (iv. 44; comp. Mark vi. 4); but the times of the prophets are gone past (v. 37; comp. Matt. xi. 13), the last of those messengers of God (comp. i. 6, 33, iii. 28) Jesus had acknowledged as His forerunner (v. 33–35); and therefore His expressions about the divine sending can be understood only of Him who was sent of God *κατ' ἐξοχήν*, *i.e.* of the Messiah.[2] His relation to God's other messengers is expressly characterized in this way, that *the Father* hath consecrated

[1] He has not assumed this calling of His own will (vii. 28, viii. 42), but He has really come in the name, *i.e.* with the commission of God (v. 43). As His messenger, God has commissioned Him with what He is to say (xii. 49), and Jesus speaks only what He gave Him (ver. 50; comp. viii. 16, 26, 40). And hence His words are the words of Him who sent Him (xiv. 24, vii. 16), they are the words of God (xvii. 8, 14, viii. 47; comp. iii. 34) simply, as He has Himself ever characterized them, according to § 18, *c*. Just as little as His words are of Himself (xii. 49), as little are His works of Himself (v. 30); it is the purpose of His life to do the will of God (vi. 38, iv. 34), and to finish the work which He, who sent Him, gave Him to do (ix. 4). For this the Father helps Him (viii. 29; comp. iii. 2), and authenticates Him as His messenger by works which, without His help, none can do (ix. 16, 32, 33, xi. 42). As sent of God, He seeks unselfishly the honour of Him who sent Him (viii. 50, vii. 18); but it is implied in the nature of this representative relation, that He who sent wishes to be Himself seen in the Messenger (xii. 44, 45, v. 24), and that the former is received in the latter (xiii. 20; comp. Matt. x. 40).

[2] As such He is indirectly designated throughout wherever He speaks of *the Father*, who has sent Him (v. 23, 36, 37, vi. 44, viii. 16, xii. 49, xiv. 24), which is here all the more significant as He calls God the Father of the disciples only

Him and sent Him (x. 36). He is therefore the Son sent by God (comp. Matt. xxi. 37), and this, to be sure, in a special sense (iii. 16, 18: ὁ μονογενής), which appeared to His Jewish opponents to involve blasphemy worthy of death (x. 36, xix. 7). "But although these found in the assumption of the name of Son, that He was making Himself equal with God (v. 18, x. 33), yet by this Jesus designates no metaphysical relation of being, as Immer, p. 509, on the other hand asserts, but, as § 17, *b*, a special relationship of love. The Father loves the Son (v. 20, xvii. 23, 26; comp. iii. 35), and it is clear, iii. 16, from the context that the designation of Him as the Only-begotten is given but for this purpose, to express the greatness of the sacrifice which it cost the Father to give Him up (§ 77, *c*), and therefore to characterize Him as the chosen Son of His love in the highest sense.

(*b*) Because Jesus is the object of the divine love, the Father has entrusted the Son, as § 17, *c*, with full Messianic authority (xvii. 2, xiii. 3; comp. iii. 35), *i.e.* He has given Him God's great work to perform (xvii. 4), the work which God has promised to do in Messianic times, and has, as it were, reserved for Himself as His prerogative.[3] To this belongs the specifically Messianic works of the raising of the dead, and of judgment (v. 21, 22), as also the gift of the Spirit promised for Messianic times (xv. 26, xvi. 7; comp.

once, and does it in such a way as to distinguish His relation to Himself from His relation to them (xx. 17). But even in John He directly declares Himself to be the Messiah only in special circumstances (iv. 25, 26), or to be the Son of God (ix. 37; comp. ver. 35) in the sense in which then ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ was a current name of honour for the Messiah (i. 34, 50, xi. 27; comp. § 17, *b*).

[3] It is involved in the nature of one's being sent of God, that He does the works of Him who sent Him (footnote 1); but even on that account is the Son the sent of God κατ' ἐξοχήν, because it is involved in the nature of the relation of Son, that He finishes not this or that work entrusted to Him, but the works of God κατ' ἐξοχήν, *i.e.* those by which God Himself has reserved for Himself to bring about the promised consummation. It is in particular the idea of essential moral likeness, which, according to § 21, *c*, footnote 1, is implied in the name of Son, and which here, according to v. 17, makes all the works of the Son to be after the example of the Father's works; and this idea is here developed so far, that the Son can do nothing without the Father's example (vv. 19, 30), but that the Father, on account of His love to the Son, a love which can withhold nothing from Him (ver. 20), shows Him all things which He Himself does, and therefore entrusts to Him the execution of His highest works.

i. 33). That God has entrusted Jesus with these works, the lifegiving and judicial activity, which He even now exercises (v. 24–27), shows, inasmuch as it is but the type and prelude of those works which He will execute one day in bringing about the final consummation (vv. 28, 29); and the transference to Him of these divine works can have but this object, to bring to Him divine honour (ver. 23).[4] These spiritual works of Jesus are, to be sure, of a kind as can be acknowledged as such only by believers. And hence God has given Him great miracles to perform, which testify that the Father has sent Jesus (v. 36), that therefore He is not a messenger of God among others, but the Son sent by God, and has honoured Him thus before all the world (viii. 54), it being presupposed that they are acknowledged as σημεῖα (vi. 26).[5] Even in the oldest tradition they appear as signs of the Messianic time, inasmuch as that time dawns with such bodily blessings, which brings to Israel the full salvation even in the earthly life (§ 13, *c*). But here they are more profoundly conceived of as emblems, which set forth, in the earthly and the bodily, the invisible spiritual works of God (ix. 3), which have been given to Jesus to perform in His Messianic calling (ver. 4).[6]

[4] By this is He shown to be not only the representative messenger (footnote 1), but also the Son in the special sense, who has been exalted to a power and a dignity equal to God; and the Father regards His own honour as suffering, if the honour allotted to Him is not also given to the Son (v. 23), an honour which the Messiah also, glorified by the resurrection, willingly accepts (xx. 28). If Beyschlag, p. 87, again asserts, that in the context of the passage, v. 23, it is not indeed *so high* an honour, but only as *real* an honour, which is implied, see on the other hand my *joh. Lehrb.* p. 218.

[5] Miracles, even the most unheard of, can, to be sure, in themselves but authenticate in general a divine mission, being proof of divine help (note *a*, footnote 1), and thus the question ever remains, whether they are of the right kind (vi. 30), or great enough (vii. 31) to prove that this mission is Messianic. Hence Jesus here rejects the unbelief which seeks for miracles, which is simply concerned about ever greater external miracles (ii. 18, vi. 30), and blames the faith which requires only concrete miracles (iv. 48, xx. 29; comp. ii. 24). The evangelist, however, steadily calls them σημεῖα, in reference to their special significance (ii. 11, 23, iv. 54, vi. 2, 14, x. 41, xii. 37, xx. 30).

[6] In the distribution of bread the Father confirms the Son as He who gives with the imperishable bread the true life (vi. 27); in the resurrection of Lazarus, as He who brings the resurrection and the life (xi. 25); in the healing of the blind, as He who enlightens man for seeing spiritually (ix. 5, 39). In this sense Jesus says that these works testify of Him (x. 25), and He points to them

(*c*) If Jesus' works, as to their contents, show that He is the Son, then one learns, from the way by which they are done, to acknowledge more exactly at the same time the specific relation of the Son to the Father. Here too, that is to say, as in § 18, *b*, Jesus does these works not by His own will and power. God has Himself given to Him to execute them (v. 36), God's glory is seen in them (xi. 40; comp. ver. 4); for God does them Himself, inasmuch as He abides continually in Him (xiv. 10: *ὁ πατὴρ ἐν ἐμοὶ μένων ποιεῖ τὰ ἔργα αὐτός*), the actual centre of His life and of His works (comp. xvii. 23: *σὺ ἐν ἐμοί*). This is, too, the first thing, x. 38, to be recognised from His works. But in this is realized what was promised for Messianic times. Jehovah is Himself come to His people (Luke i. 17, 76). He no longer speaks or works incidentally by means of His messengers; He has found a perfect organ, in whom He can continually abide and work, to whom therefore He gives to do everything (v. 20; comp. footnote 3), whom He has made to be the exclusive and abiding organ for His final saving work, so that He hands over to Him everything (xiii. 3; comp. Matt. xi. 27), and retains nothing any more to be His own exclusive possession (xvi. 15: *πάντα ὅσα ἔχει ὁ πατὴρ ἐμά ἐστιν*). But it can only be involved in this, that the Father, as the heart-searcher, has acknowledged in Him the organ perfectly suited for this end (x. 15; comp. Matt. xi. 27, and therewith § 17, *a*, footnote 1). As it is involved in the essence of Sonship in general that the Father loves Him (viii. 42; comp. xv. 23), so He loves the Father, and shows it, in that He hopes in childlike trust on His abiding help (xvi. 32), and in childlike obedience fulfils all His commands (xiv. 31; comp. iv. 34, viii. 29, 46, 55, xv. 10). It is peculiar to this perfect love that nothing is called its own in any exclusive sense (xvii. 10: *τὰ ἐμὰ πάντα σά ἐστιν*), and hence the Father can give to Him everything, which is His own (*καὶ τὰ σὰ ἐμά*), because

(x. 37, 38, xiv. 11), as to the evidence that the Father has borne witness for Him (viii. 18). For these works, which none other had done, rendered them inexcusable (xv. 24), if they did not acknowledge that the Father had sent Him (ver. 21). Whoever was not in a position to acknowledge Him, in His highest spiritual activity (v. 24–27), as the Son entrusted with God's Messianic works, these suggestive symbols ought at least to be guides to enable them to understand the significance of His appearance.

the Son yet receives all as a gift from Him (ver. 7).[7] Nay, that love is nothing else than that perfect personal dependence, by which one's whole being is rooted in another; and because the Son is in this sense in the Father, so can the Father be in the Son (x. 38, xvii. 21), the one is the condition of the other (xiv. 10, 11). For He will not be thought of as selfless organ. As the Father has life in Himself, so has He given to the Son to have life in Himself (v. 26). It is implied in this, to be sure, that the life of the Son, even objectively, is rooted in the Father; but only in so far as the Son willingly and constantly acknowledges this, is the being in Him the expression for the fullest personal dependence on Him.[8]

(*d*) This mutual relationship between the Father and the Son constitutes what Jesus calls their oneness, since without more ado, xvii. 21, 22, it is exchanged with ἓν εἶναι, and both are similarly put parallel with the ἓν εἶναι of believers. What Jesus says, x. 38, of this mutual relationship is, from the connection, but an exposition of, and an apology for, the declaration: ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἕν ἐσμεν (ver. 30); and this declaration is to show how the Son, sent by God, knows

[7] Hence Jesus, in answer to His prayer, obtains everything He does from God (xi. 22, 41), by which He is always sure of being heard (ver. 42), because God likewise certainly hears Him, who does His will, because He cannot hear sinners (ix. 16, 31), so that His prayers always at once pass over into thanksgiving (vi. 11, xi. 41). Whatever, then, the Father gives Him to do, that He does in His name (x. 25). And thus there is here perfected, but in an absolute way, what was even involved in the relation of a messenger (footnote 1). Because the Son is in the Father, He speaks nothing of Himself (xiv. 10; comp. xii. 49), and He does nothing of Himself (viii. 28; comp. x. 32); it is involved in the very nature of the relation of Son, that He can do nothing of Himself (v. 19, 30; comp. footnote 3). This, however, is not thought of as a metaphysical impotence, but only moral, inasmuch as the love of the Son to the Father, by which His complete dependence rests on Him, leads Him to continual obedience to the Father, and so enables Him to be His perfect organ.

[8] The living Father can send only the living Son as His organ, but the Son so sent is conscious to Himself, now and continually, that He lives, because the Father wills that He live, and gives to Him life (vi. 57: ζῶ διὰ τὸν πατέρα). The continual free joyful impulse of this consciousness is the abiding in Him, as the connection with ver. 56 shows that Jesus will say of Himself what implies an abiding in the Father, and an abiding of the Father in Him. This peculiarity of His life from God, and in God, cannot here be perfectly manifested to the disciples, when they see Him put in many ways under the conditions of their own earthly existence. But when He has been delivered unto death, and they see Him return again living, then only will they quite acknowledge Him as Son, who with His life is rooted in the Father alone, and is in Him (xiv. 19, 20).

that those who are made partakers of the Messianic salvation are as safe in His hand (ver. 28) as in the almighty hand of the Father (ver. 29). The Father is in the Son, and keeps only by means of His hand; the Son is in the Father, and keeps only by His power. The position of the Son as the perfect organ of the Father, implies in itself, that any separate working of the Father and the Son is excluded, that both are one in their working. It is on that account likewise but another expression for this unity,[9] if it is said, xiv. 9, that whoever has seen the Son has seen the Father, which in ver. 10 is likewise referred back as that unity to the Son's being in the Father, and the Father in the Son. Because in virtue of that oneness in all His working, the working of the Father is revealed, therefore is the Father seen in the Son as soon as the former is acknowledged in His specific relation to the Father (ver. 7). There is not required any more a theophany in the Old Testament fashion, as Philip desires (ver. 8); the perfect theophany is given in the Son, the self-manifestation of God in Him by whom He brings about His highest purposes of salvation. And therefore no one acknowledges the Father, who hath sent Him, who has not acknowledged the Son to be what He is, His perfect revelation (viii. 19, xv. 21).

§ 144. *The Heavenly Origin of the Son of Man.*

Jesus traces back His special knowledge of God to a seeing of God in His original existence with the Father, in which from eternity, as the object of the divine love, He possessed the divine glory (*a*). But He has come down from heaven to earth, because His Messianic calling required His appearing upon the earth (*b*). As He who was originally in heaven, Jesus

[9] Thus neither are the words, x. 30, used of the substantial unity of both (comp. Köstlin, p. 93 f.), or of their identity of nature (comp. Baur, p. 357), nor those of xiv. 9 of their equality of nature (comp. Köstlin, p. 95), or of their equality in dignity (comp. Frommann, p. 390); but there is nothing said in either passage about the original (trinitarian) relation of the Son to the Father; nay, He who appeared on the earth only speaks of Himself and of His works. In the latter passage especially is it evident, that what is true in a certain sense even of any messenger of God (xii. 45; comp. footnote 1), must be true in an absolute sense of the Son sent by God. He is the highest revelation of the Father, who hath sent Him.

is the peerless Son of man, who even now does not possess the divine glory, but yet is certain of constant divine miraculous help (*c*). In His earthly existence He is, like every son of man, put under the divine law, and looks up to the Father as His God, while He feels Himself a stranger in no way to human joys and conflicts (*d*).

(*a*) As the living organ of the revelation of the Father, Jesus must know Himself as such, and this presupposes that He perfectly knows the Father, who is revealed in His works. This perfect knowledge of God, which can be compared only with the knowledge of the Son by the Father, because none other but He has it (x. 15, xvii. 25), Jesus claims for Himself, even in the oldest tradition (Matt. xi. 27; comp. § 17, *a*; 20, *a*); but here, too, is the point where the Johannean self-testimony of Jesus decisively goes beyond that of the Synoptists. While Jesus sinks Himself in the origin of this peerless knowledge of God, He is conscious that it is to be traced to no point in His earthly life, and to no analogy in the religious experience of other messengers of God. It is a particular fact of the past to which He points, which now continues (ἑώρακα) in its workings. He describes it as a seeing of the Father unapproachable to every other (vi. 46, iii. 11; comp. ver. 32), which He has had with the Father Himself (viii. 38; comp. vi. 46, vii. 29).[1] And He points thereby to a prehistorical existence with the Father, in which He has seen God, as the perfected hope one day in the heavenly life to see Him (§ 34, *b*). This existence of His, which excludes all becoming, Jesus puts in opposition to the historical appearing of Abraham (viii. 58), and He speaks of the glory which He had then with the Father before the foundation of the world, as He hopes to receive it at His exaltation (xvii. 5).[2]

[1] Although the εἶναι παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ may in itself also designate the divine sending (ix. 16, 33), yet is it, vii. 29, distinguished from it (comp. xvii. 8); and vi. 46 can also only designate a coming from an existence with the Father, because Jesus alone lays claim to it. Because He alone, in virtue of direct intuition, which presupposes an existence with the Father, possesses the perfect knowledge of God, He can announce the heavenly things, to the knowledge of which none can come without Him (iii. 13). On the other hand, He nowhere speaks of divine revelations or visions given to Him here on the earth, although Beyschlag, p. 96 f., undertakes to point out such.

[2] Thus, as certainly as the παρὰ σεαυτῷ refers to the exaltation to heavenly

This glory, which distinguishes the Being of God from all creatures, the Son could possess only in that prehistorical life, because the Father has loved the Son before the foundation of the world (ver. 24); and this love, involved in the nature of the paternal relation, drew Him to the Son from the beginning, to share all with Him (comp. § 143). Thus it is shown that Jesus knew Himself from eternity to be elected to be the object of the divine love.

(*b*) If the Son was originally with the Father, then the sending (iii. 17) of Him is not only the commissioning of an earth-born one with a divine mission, but the giving up of the Son into the relative distance from God of an earthly life (ver. 16: ἔδωκεν). The Father, from whom He is, because He was with Him, has sent Him (vii. 19), and so is He come (into the earthly world) (viii. 42: ἥκω), although He was not ἐκ τῶν κάτω but ἐκ τῶν ἄνω (ver. 23), which, according to the connection with vv. 21, 22, can but designate His origin from the heavenly world, to which He returns again at His departure (comp. iii. 31: ὁ ἄνωθεν = ὁ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἐρχόμενος). To this heavenly origin He points back, when His coming into the world, *i.e.* His historical appearance (iii. 19, ix. 39, xii. 46; comp. i. 9), is preceded by[3]

life, in which He is to receive this δόξα, so certainly does the παρά σοι speak of a pretemporal heavenly existence with the Father, in which He really already possessed it. If Beyschlag, p. 87 f., refers this passage again to the glory ideally suitable for Jesus, *i.e.* appointed for Him in the divine purposes, then has Scholten, p. 96, even in this explanation acknowledged the παρά σοι and the εἶχον as containing proof for the pre-existence; and likewise the passage viii. 58 itself is an explanation of the Messianic destination of Jesus approaching that of Beyschlag. But the εἰμί in it excludes every reference to a pre-existence in the divine purpose (yet comp. Beyschlag, p. 86); and in answer to the objection of the Jews (ver. 57), it claims for the historical person Jesus a prehistorical pre-existence without any beginning, and so even the unbelieving Jews rightly grounded on it a complaint of blasphemy worthy of death (ver. 59). A word of the Baptist, also, John has already understood in the sense that it speaks of this prehistorical existence of Jesus (i. 15, 30: πρῶτός μου ἦν).

[3] Scholten (pp. 102, 103) mistakes the significance of this expression, in that he refers it to His heavenly origin, and finds himself thereby compelled to explain the preceding γεγέννημαι (xviii. 37), in contradiction to the entirely synonymous γεννηθῆναι εἰς τὸν κόσμον (xvi. 21), of a being born spiritually of God. That the analogous ἀποστέλλειν εἰς τὸν κόσμον (xvii. 18) is characterized by the parallel sending out of the disciples as a mission to the world entrusted to Him, he admits, p. 101; but then x. 36 must also be so understood, where, likewise, the sending of other messengers of God stands parallel; and if, iii. 17, the sending

His going out *παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ* (xvi. 27, 28; comp. xvii. 8 = *ἀπὸ Θεοῦ*: xiii. 3, xvi. 30), or the synonymous expression, *ἐκ τοῦ πατρός* (xvi. 28; comp. viii. 42), which Scholten, p. 101, erroneously refers to the divine *γέννησις*.[4] But in the same obedience, in which Jesus on earth showed the love of the Son to the Father (§ 143, *c*), did the Son, beloved from eternity, come down from heaven to fulfil the will of Him who sent Him (vi. 38), and this will of God was directed to the Messianic blessing of men, a blessing which finds its consummation in the resurrection (vv. 39, 40), as also in the execution of the Messianic judgment, which the Father has committed to the Son (v. 22, 29), just because He is the Son of man (ver. 27). For the discharge of these tasks was conditioned by His earthly human appearance.[5]

(*c*) Even in John, Jesus very frequently designates Himself as the Son of man (*ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου*). There can

of the Son into the world presupposes the giving of Him (ver. 16) as, vi. 38, the *καταβαίνειν ἀπὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ* (comp. vii. 29), then that is involved in the peculiarity of this messenger of God, but it does not give occasion for any other interpretation of this formula.

[4] Any possibility to refer this otherwise than to a going out from the heavenly existence with the Father, is excluded by this, that to it, xvi. 28, is opposed the leaving of the world, and the going home to the Father (xiv. 12, 28, xvii. 11, 13; comp. vii. 33, xvi. 5, 10; comp. xiii. 1, 3), which doubtless must be understood of His exaltation to heaven (comp. xii. 23: *ὑψοῦσθαι ἐκ τῆς γῆς*, xiv. 2). Without taking up these decisive examples, Beyschlag, appealing to the figurative character of these expressions, would find the supernatural birth of Jesus indicated by them (pp. 79-82); and he presses the *ὢν ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ* in iii. 13, in order to find an uninterrupted fellowship with God (p. 99 f.; comp. Schenkel, p. 376). As that coming of His into the world is designated, in a plastic, Biblical way, as a coming down from heaven in which He was (comp. vi. 33–58), so this return thither (xx. 17) is spoken of as a going up to the Father, and, vi. 62, Jesus says of it expressly, that He goes up thither, where He was before.

[5] In order to give life to the world, the true bread of God must come down from heaven (vi. 33), in order that it may be partaken of, and so the life contained in it may be imparted to the world (vv. 50, 51, 58), or, without a figure, He must appear as Man among men, in order to tell them the truth (viii. 40), which brings life. Just because He thereby offers them salvation, He can also execute judgment on them, when they have decided either for or against it. The identification of the *υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου* (v. 27) with Jesus' standing designation of Himself, *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου* (comp. Frommann, p. 396; Beyschlag, p. 29; Scholten, p. 110), is not to be thereby excused, that here the expression stands as the predicate, since the two articles belong to the essence of that self-testimony (§ 16, *b*), and robs the proof of its special moment which establishes it.

here be no doubt that this name has its origin in Daniel (§ 16, *a*), since the (original) Son of man, who is in heaven (iii. 13), necessarily brings to remembrance Dan. vii. 13, where one like the Son of man comes in the clouds of heaven.[6] But this passage directly shows that among the sons of men He is alone, because He, like no other, was originally in heaven (iii. 13), whither He will return again (vi. 62).[7] As He who came from heaven, He possesses, in conformity with His original nature, a glory which, in His human appearance, is not manifest in itself, is acknowledged throughout His earthly activity only in the narrower circle (xiii. 31; comp. xvii. 10), and in the wider circle will be acknowledged only after His death, at His glorification (xii. 23). As the Son of man who has come down from heaven, He waits for His exaltation, which is to bring round even the world itself, and will serve this purpose of making Him known as He is, according to His original Being (viii. 28). But He could fulfil even that peculiar calling to which His designating Him-

[6] Here, too, the form of the name, as in § 16, *b*, can but point to the peculiarity of the Son of man, who exists not as a son of man among others (v. 27), but who can say of Himself, what no other can say of himself. At any rate, it sometimes appears as though this peerlessness, as § 16, *c*, lay only in His calling, which all confessed, yet can be applied only to one. For, vi. 27, it is the Son of man who gives the imperishable food, which leads to the Messianic salvation, or which, by His death, brings life to the world (ver. 53); and, iii. 14, 15, that He may do this, there is appointed for Him a destiny already prefigured in the Old Testament, on which account even the people would by this name think of the Anointed One, who was to set up the everlasting kingdom (xii. 34). But if the oldest tradition, on the ground of the words about the second coming, expected the coming of the Son of man from heaven, beheld in Daniel's prophecy only in the future, then the present use of the name in the mouth of Jesus by John, on the ground of the sayings explained in notes *a*, *b*, may contain the reference to His heavenly origin, as Daniel asserts it of the Messiah.

[7] Beyschlag's assertion that, according to these passages, the Son of man pre-existed, an assertion which is to refer them to an ideal pre-existence (p. 29 f.), has but apparently an unlimited support on the words. With Him the *personal* Son of man, who came down from heaven, and goes up into heaven, is an entirely different subject from the heavenly Son of man in His ideal (*impersonal*) pre-existence. According to our conception, Jesus designates His person simply, according to His historical appearance, by the name of Son of man, but He regards the latter as the identical subject of the former, as of His prehistorical pre-existence. Thus all those results which Beyschlag, p. 85, draws from vi. 62 in favour of an ideal pre-existence of Christ, fall to the ground of themselves; and since he designates this passage the key to the other passages for the pre-existence, his misinterpretation of them falls at the same time.

self as the Son of man seems sometimes to point (vi. 27, 53, iii. 14, 15; comp. footnote 6), only because He who was the Son of man had come down from heaven (comp. vi. 33, 50, 51, 58, iii. 13), and because on Him as such the angels of God continually ascend and descend from the opened heavens, in order to bring to Him the divine miraculous help (i. 52; comp. Matt. iv. 11).[8]

(*d*) In consequence of His entrance on the earthly historical life, Jesus, like any other son of man, is put under the divine law (viii. 55, xv. 10), which tells Him what He is to do (xiv. 31), and what He is to suffer (x. 17, 18, xviii. 11). Even under the most pressing human impulses to act, He must wait till the hour appointed by God for Him to act is come (ii. 4, vii. 8; comp. ver. 10; xi. 6; comp. Matt. iv. 3, 4, and therewith § 18, *b*). Although in virtue of His original existence with the Father He possesses full knowledge of God, which enables Him at any time to proclaim the truth, yet must He always receive the command from the Father what He is to speak (xii. 49, 50), and He speaks only what He has heard of the Father (v. 30, viii. 26, 28, 40, xv. 15), and He gives only, further, the words which He has received of the Father (xvii. 8), because even His words are but the fulfilment of the calling which God has given Him.[9] As the

[8] Christ's miraculous works thereby appear as works given Him by God for the discharge of His calling as Son of man. As the Son of God, He could, in conformity with His nature, do nothing without the Father; as the Son of man, who as such no longer possesses the divine glory (xvii. 5), can He do nothing without the divine miraculous help; but now *the* Son of man, who by His origin and His calling stands alone among the children of men, is from the very beginning of His official activity (ἀπ' ἀρτι) sure of this constant divine miraculous help.

[9] It is clear from this, that Jesus, by free moral self-determination, realized (§ 143, *c*, footnote 7) in His earthly life the nature of the relation of Son, by which He could do nothing of Himself (v. 19, 30; comp. § 143, *b*, footnote 3). To be sure, it is the highest freedom for Him to do the Father's will (iv. 34), yet He speaks of the fulfilling His will (v. 30, vi. 38), and of seeking His honour (vii. 18, viii. 49, 50), as one to whom the conquering of His own will and self-seeking is a moral task, as it is to others. Although He was from eternity the object of the divine love, yet must He earn it ever afresh by His own loving obedience (x. 17, 18, xv. 10). Although in virtue of His calling He can be certain of constant divine help, yet must He make Himself worthy of it, by acting in a way well-pleasing to God (viii. 29). But on that account, like any other man, may He look for a reward for discharging the task given Him. Although originally He possessed the divine glory (xvii. 24), and may therefore

Son, clothed from eternity with the divine glory, Jesus cannot certainly be thought of in the position in contrast to God in which man stands in contrast with God. It is, on the other hand, quite intelligible how the Son, become man, having entered into all the conditions of the human life, must show Himself as such also in contrast with God, speaks of the only God (v. 44), the true God (xvii. 3), designates Him as His God (xx. 17), honours Him (viii. 49), and prays to Him (iv. 22, xii. 27, xvii. 1 ff.; comp. vi. 11, xi. 41, 42). Only as such can he designate the Father as the greater (xiv. 28).[10] It is but the other side of this true human position towards God, if the world touches Him all round in the same way as it does all other men.[11] Because with conscious consent to the divine will (vi. 38) He left the heavenly existence with the Father along with His glory, He must also be introduced into the divine consciousness as into the sensibility of the world of the sons of men.

§ 145. *The Incarnation of the Logos.*

John has shown in his Gospel that Jesus is the Messiah, or the Son of God, while he narrates how he had seen in the earthly life of Jesus the divine glory of the Only-begotten (*a*).

look for His final heavenly glory, in conformity with His nature, yet He hopes for it only as the reward for the discharge of His earthly calling (xiii. 32, xvii. 4, 5; comp. § 103, *d;* 120, *d*).

[10] While it would be an incongruity, bordering on blasphemy, to seek to establish this for any other man, it yields a good sense, if the Son, who originally (in His heavenly existence with the Father) was equal to God in glory, claims that all who really love Him are to rejoice at His return to the Father, as He Himself rejoiced at it (comp. xvii. 13), because His going to the Father, throned in glory, made Him a partaker of that glory. Jesus accepts divine worship only (xx. 28) when, after His resurrection, He is on His way to His heavenly glory (ver. 17), in which He is to receive the full divine honour after finishing His Messianic work (v. 23; comp. § 143, *b*).

[11] Hence is He subjected to the natural changes of human impulses. He is gladdened in fellowship with His disciples (xv. 11; comp. xvii. 33); the pain of a dear friend (xi. 3, 5, 36; comp. xiii. 23) draws tears from Him (xi. 35). The irritation to which He yields at the grave of His friend (xi. 33, 38), His higher peace of soul, in which He overcomes all anxiety and restlessness (xiv. 27), as also the deep shudder which seized His soul at the sight of death, and which must be conquered by prayer and resignation to the divine will (xii. 27; comp. xiii. 21, xviii. 11), show that in His earthly life He felt Himself quite as a man.

In order to designate the original nature of this Son of God, he calls Him, by an Old Testament expression, the Word, which had been from the very beginning the medium of creation and of revelation (*b*). As the Son of God was manifested by His appearance in flesh, so this Logos became flesh, and thereby the object of concrete perception (*c*). The idea of the communication of the Spirit in baptism is not irreconcilable, in the evangelist's conception, with these suppositions, if it is not even expressly brought about by them (*d*).

(*a*) If the evangelist, by means of his Gospel, would lead his readers to a belief in the Messiahship of Jesus (xx. 31 : ὅτι Ἰησοῦς ἐστὶν ὁ Χριστός), this cannot have the same meaning for him, who writes for Gentile-Christian readers, as in the first evangelists (§ 136, *d*). If he more exactly designates the exalted One as the Son of God, then this name in his mouth is not, as in that of the Jews (i. 34, 50, xi. 27), simply a Messianic title of honour, but, on the ground of Jesus' self-manifestation developed in the Gospel, it designates the eternal Son of God sent by God from heaven to accomplish the Messianic work (i. 4, 10, 14). In the light of this, John has acknowledged that the Old Testament prophets, when they prophesied of the Messiah, spoke of this eternal Son of God, and saw (xii. 41) that original glory proper to Him (xvii. 5, 24).[1] John also yet preserves the original significance of

[1] It is therefore quite the same whether the Christian confession is thus formulated,—that Jesus is the Son of God (I. iv. 15, v. 5),—or that He is the Christ (I. v. 1), without John's giving any other signification to this name (against Biedermann, p. 256), and that, as Gess, p. 530, asserts, after the example of the false teachers. If the apostle hence characterizes the anti-christian false doctrines of his time, that they deny that Jesus is the Christ (I. ii. 22; comp. iv. 3), then he understands by this that those doctrines deny that Jesus is a person with the original divine nature, which, with him, as in the Epistle to the Hebrews (§ 118, *b*), the name of son designates; and because any other than the Son promised in the Old Testament, and made manifest in Jesus, can be only a lying fiction, so those false teachers, when they speak of a Χριστός or υἱός, yet have not throughout the Son (I. ii. 23). The ordinary name Ἰησοῦς Χριστός (i. 17, xvii. 3; I. ii. 1, iv. 2, v. 6; II. 7) has won for the apostle a special meaning, inasmuch as, in opposition to those false teachers, it expresses the identity of Jesus with the promised Messiah (in his own sense), on which account he is in the habit of so designating the (eternal) Son of God by a more solemn term (ὁ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦς Χριστός : I. i. 3, iii. 23, v. 20; comp. I. i. 7; II. 3). But the name ὁ Χριστός alone occurs only II. 9 (comp. § 134, *a*, footnote 1); and it is there, too, expressly emphasized, that in the doctrine of this

the name of son (§ 17), since, i. 4, x. 14, the relation of Christ's sonship is urged in order to magnify the greatness of the sacrifice which God has made in His mission into the world (comp. § 77, *c*). He is likewise called, on that account, ver. 9, the Only-begotten, for whom the sitting down at the right hand of God is no longer emphasized as specially characteristic, but His resting in the bosom of the Father (i. 18), because this latter is the sign of the closest relation of love (comp. xiii. 23).[2] To be sure, it corresponds to this relation of love (comp. § 144, *a*), that the Father pours out all His glory on the Only-begotten (i. 14: δόξαν ὡς μονογενοῦς παρὰ πατρός).[3] And because the apostle has beheld this glory, he can point out the revelation of it in the earthly historical life of Jesus. In the great miracles of divine power, as also in

Χριστός one has the Son, and in Him the Father. Jesus, on the other hand, is usually called ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ (I. iii. 8, iv. 10, v. 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 20), or the Son simply (I. ii. 22, 23, 24, iv. 14, v. 12; II. 9).

[2] There is by no means involved, as Baur, p. 357, supposes, even in the very designation as μονογενής, the idea of generation, whether we think by it, with Scholten, p. 82, of a generation in the metaphysical sense, or, with Beyschlag, p. 154, of supernatural generation. Rather, I. iv. 9 f., as John iii. 16, 18 (comp. § 143, *a*), the context shows that the μονογενής designates the Son only as the only, and therefore as the highest, object of the divine love, whom to give up was love's greatest sacrifice. On the other hand, the idea of γεννᾶσθαι ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ, elsewhere common to the apostle, is *never* transferred to Christ. As, i. 18, participation in the divine kingly glory is no more mentioned, as elsewhere throughout, as a characteristic for the exalted Son, who alone is spoken of here (against Beyschlag, p. 151; Schenkel, p. 375; Gess, p. 562), so the name κύριος, which designates the Messianic lordship of the exalted Christ, does not at all occur in the Epistles (II. 3, κυρίου is false). Only in the Gospel is Jesus sometimes, as in Luke (§ 138, *a*, footnote 1), in the narrative parts called ὁ κύριος (iv. 1, vi. 23, xi. 2, xx. 18, 20, xxi. 7, 12). The address κύριε, and the self-designation derived from that (xiii. 13–16, xv. 20), has, besides xx. 28, nothing to do with its specific position of honour (comp. § 18, *d*).

[3] To connect παρά with μονογενοῦς, by which it will be said: the Only-begotten of the Father (comp. Schultz as above, p. 211), is unquestionably contrary to the language. But, in general, the words are not about the concrete person of the Only-begotten, although Gess, p. 559, yet simply explains them as though the words were τοῦ μονογ. The expression designates a glory so great as none but an only-begotten Son of the Father can have it, inasmuch as the Father makes the only Son the exclusive possessor of all He has (comp. Scholten, p. 81). And this glory, no doubt, by no means consists of the grace and truth (comp. Neander, p. 884, and Beyschlag, p. 170), or of His special fellowship with the Father (Gess, p. 561), but in the fulness of all the glorious divine attributes,—in particular, of the omnipotence and the omniscience. We have accordingly in John not the sharply-outlined Pauline idea of δόξα (§ 76, *d*), but the early apostolic one (comp. § 118, *c*, footnote 7).

the ever fresh tokens of His divine omniscience, has Jesus revealed His glory (ii. 11; comp. xi. 4, xvii. 10);[4] so that the Gospel can conclude with the confession of His Godhead (xx. 28), and therewith complete its proof that Jesus was the promised Messiah, *i.e.* (in his sense) the eternal divine Son of God. It is true John would not by that say that Jesus possessed, even in His earthly life, the δόξα peculiar to Him from the beginning (xvii. 5), as Köstlin, p. 150, and even Scholten, p. 105, maintain; for he even speaks of an exaltation to glory which awaited Him only after His death (vii. 39, xii. 16: δοξασθῆναι). But the Father, who is said to do these almighty works and to speak these omniscient words, has therewith given to Him a reflection of that glory (xvii. 22), in order to bear witness thereby to the world of that glory, which originally belonged to Him as the only-begotten Son, and which He had laid aside in His earthly existence. Only because it depends on the evangelist so to prove the one by the other, the facts of His life, which even the oldest tradition in substance knew, appear here in a light which at times seems to deny the actual humanity of the Son of God.

(*b*) The Son of God, who at the conclusion of the Gospel is addressed as Θεός (xx. 28), must naturally have been from the

[4] The first of these tokens was like a miracle of creative power, by which wine came to be where water had been (ii. 9). The two healings of the sick, iv. 53, v. 8, were done by a simple almighty word, which had effect partly in the distance, partly in His immediate presence. In the distribution of the bread and the walking on the lake (chap. vi.), Jesus showed a divine lordship over the elements. By the healing of the blind man by Jesus only an unheard-of thing is narrated (ix. 32), by which a new creation of the sight, denied to the blind man, was brought about; and finally, the work of God (v. 21) in the resurrection of the dead (xi. 43). Plainly this definite number of seven great miraculous works of God are selected in order to point out in each a token of His divine omnipotence from another side, as, § 143, *b*, there are tokens of His original divine nature. The same is true of the proof of His omniscience. Jesus, as the heart-searcher (comp. I. iii. 20), knew what is in man (ii. 25), and verifies this ever afresh (i. 43, 48, iv. 35, v. 42, vi. 15, 61, vii. 19, viii. 40). He knew beforehand the most secret development in men (vi. 64, 70, xiii. 11); He divined the thoughts of the disciples (xvi. 19), and they therefore acknowledge His omniscience (ver. 30; comp. xxi. 17). He knew all secrets (i. 49, 51, iv. 19, 29, xi. 4, 14, 15), and He knew all the future (xviii. 4; comp. ii. 19, iii. 14, vii. 33, xii. 35, xiii. 1, 38). The whole history of His suffering is thereupon set forth to show how all His words were fulfilled (xviii. 1–3; comp. xiii. 26, xviii. 4–7; comp. x. 18, xviii. 8, 9; comp. xvi. 32, xvii. 12, xviii. 10–27; comp. xiii. 38, xviii. 28–xix. 16; comp. xii. 32, 33, xviii. 32, xx. 8, 9; comp. ii. 19).

very beginning in the divine nature (Θεὸς ἦν, i. 1). He is indeed come into the world for this purpose, that He, who was Himself the true God, may make known Him that is true (I. v. 20).[5] But then He must also have been from eternity as God Himself (I. i. 2, 13, 14: ὁ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς).[6] No clearer evidence can be given for the fact, that the name of son did not by itself designate the original nature of Christ (note *a*), than that John searches for a special designation for the nature of the Son of God in His eternal existence with the Father, and His living mutual fellowship with Him (i. 1: πρὸς τὸν Θεόν; comp. I. i. 2). But such a designation can he find only in the Old Testament, which, according to his conception, had already prophesied of the eternal Son. Here he found with God from the beginning His word mentioned in many ways as living, operative.[7] Nay, since it is even the nature

[5] The tautology, which arises from referring the οὗτος to God, is not removed by arbitrarily supplying: that is to say, only the Father of Jesus Christ (comp. Huther *in loc.*), although God has never before been so designated. Rather has He, according to the current interpretation, been twice so called, Him that is true; and that by Him that is true, the true God is meant, what is now to be once more confirmed has been *d priori* presupposed without more ado. But the contrast in ver. 21 of εἴδωλα can prove nothing, since what is dealt with in this verse is ever how we can come to the knowledge of the true God. But Gess, p. 537, reasons from ἐν τῷ ἀληθινῷ, to which, according to the correct interpretation, ἐν τῷ υἱῷ is and must be in apposition, because the meaning that the Son is the medium of our existence in God runs counter to the whole Johannean use of speech (comp. § 149, *c*, footnote 8).

[6] It is to no purpose denied by Reuss (ii. pp. 438, 439 [E. T. ii. 391, 392]), that ἀπ' ἀρχῆς is to be taken in the absolute sense. The beginning can be but that point of time at which our thinking in general begins. As there is no such point,—because to any such point of time another such can be thought of as antecedent,—there is involved in it the idea of eternity *a parte ante*. In another way is this expressed in the Gospel by a play on Gen. i. 1: in this way, that at the beginning of the divine creation, from which the Scriptures begin, He did not in any way come into existence, but He was (i. 1: ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν). But this was already given to the evangelist, by the testimony of Jesus about Himself (§ 144, *a*).

[7] It must be regarded as acknowledged, that in all Old Testament expressions about that word there is yet no hypostatizing of it implied, but only a poetical objectivizing of it (comp. Gess, p. 625 f.). Even the term מֵימְרָא דַיְיָ in the Targums designates but the revelation which God gives of Himself by means of His Word in the world, and which has on that account divine authority (Deut. xviii. 19; 1 Kings viii. 50) and divine energy (Gen. xxxix. 2, 21; 2 Sam. vi. 7), without its being thought of as having an independent life (comp. Gess, p. 658). But the way in which the Word of God is here conceived of shows plainly, that if John sought in the Old Testament for an attestation of the prehistorical

of the Word to reveal the inner mind of Him who speaks, so it was easy to find the Son, who by His appearance on the earth had been the Revealer of the Father (§ 143, *d*), designated by this Word of God. When now, in the Prologue of the Gospel, he will establish the proper point of view to look on the Son of God in His historical appearance, he infers from this that the Logos was in the beginning with God (i. 1, 2); and when, in the Epistles, he will express in one word what the eye-witnesses of His life have acknowledged as His original nature, he calls Him the Word (I. i. 1).[8] But everything which he, proceeding from the statements of the words of Christ, teaches of this Logos, is now taken simply from the teaching of the Old Testament about the word of God. As the world of God was created by it (Ps. xxxiii. 6; comp. Gen. i.), so the Logos is the medium of creation, in that the world and all which was made was made by Him (i. 3, 10; comp. § 79, *c*; 103, *b*; 118, *d*). That the materials, in what was thus created, are included, is, to be sure, not said; but it is not also to be excluded by reflections so foreign as Scholten, p. 83, inserts. As, further, the Word of God comes to the prophets (Jer. i. 4, 11, ii. 1),—nay, is seen by them (Isa. ii. 1), —then have the prophets beheld the glory of the Logos (xii. 41), and He has become the medium of all revelations of God generally from the very beginning (i. 4, 9: τὸ φῶς

existence of the Son, whom he had acknowledged as the perfect revelation of God, he could find it only in what was there said of the Word of God. The experience of the living energy of this Word could not lead to a hypostatizing of it; but if John had learned to acknowledge the Son of God as the independent (personal) organ of God's revelation, the Son who from the beginning was with the Father, and from this point of view read the Old Testament (perhaps with the former interpretation of the Targums), which was to testify of the Son (John v. 34), then must he have been led thereby to take that living Word of God for a designation of this Son of God. If the author of the Apocalypse had designated the exalted Christ as the Word of God, which makes known the (judicial) will of God, while it executes it (§ 134, *d*, footnote 5), then might the evangelist find in the Old Testament Word of God the designation of the nature of the eternal Son of God in His prehistorical existence.

[8] The Word of God is in the New Testament often enough called simply the Word (§ 46, *a*; 89, *a*; 139, *b*, footnote 2); and when John wished to express, that he did not mean a single word, which had proceeded from God, but the (personal) Word having life in Himself (i. 4), such a Word as He had acknowledged in Jesus (v. 26, vi. 57), he had to designate Him as the Word simply, the Word which was not a λόγος θεοῦ, but was itself of divine nature (θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος: i. 1).

τῶν ἀνθρώπων). Therefore is Israel, in which God had His specific place for revelation, become the very people of the Logos (i. 11; comp. § 79, *c*; 118, *d*). Of the ways by which Paul and the Epistle to the Hebrews were led by inference backwards to the eternal divine nature and working of the Son (§ 79, 103, 118), there is in John, whose entire spiritual way is otherwise far removed from such reflections (§ 141, *b*), as little any trace as in the author of the Apocalypse (§ 134, *d*). Rather the way in which the Prologue refers *à priori* to the history of creation points plainly enough to the Old Testament origin of His ideas.[9]

(*c*) The sending of the only-begotten Son is never by John, as with Paul (§ 79, *c*; 103, *c*), put in the point of view of a humiliation; it has rather helped to reveal Him as to His

[9] It is of decisive importance that one be quite clear that the Johannean expressions about the Divine Being who was in the beginning with God, so long as one allows the evangelist to regard the words of Christ in his Gospel to be *bona fide* the words of the historical Jesus, cannot possibly be the result of any *d priori* speculation about the nature of God, as Frommann, starting from the idea that God is love, ascribes (pp. 105, 134–137) to the apostle. Only if one regards the Fourth Gospel as a conscious invention of a Christian Gnostic of the second century, who puts his philosophical theories into the mouth of Jesus, has one a right to ask where he got the idea of a divine mediatory Being, whose incarnation he believes he finds in Jesus. But then, moreover, the idea of a God hid in Himself, who needs an intermediate being for His activity in the world (comp. Köstlin, pp. 85–89; Baur, p. 356), contradicts the idea of the evangelist, who by no means shrinks from assuming a direct activity of God in the world (v. 17, 21, vi. 37, 44 f., 65, xvii. 11), as Reuss himself admits, in that he finds an inconsequent carrying through of the speculative premiss of the Johannean theology (ii. pp. 432, 440 f. [E. T. ii. 386, 393 f.]). But for him who holds the words of Christ in the Gospel to be trustworthy as regards their essential contents, the inquiry has lost all significance, whether it was the Alexandrian doctrine of wisdom, or Philo's doctrine of the Logos—about which even yet it is disputed whether it regarded the Logos as really hypostatized and a Divine Being—that could have led the apostle to those statements, since the premises for them are completely given in what the evangelist regarded as the words and deeds of the historical Jesus. It might therefore at most be made a question, as even Baur, p. 353, in principle admits, whether the apostle had borrowed the name of Logos, which he gives to the Son of God in His prehistorical existence, from a philosophy then in vogue (comp. Schmid, ii. p. 368; Lutterbeck, p. 264). To be sure, a comparison of the terms used by Philo very little coincides here, since in his use of the word λόγος the significations Reason and Word are interchanged, while with John only the latter is confessedly admissible. But the current assertion, that the way in which John presupposes the name as known points to some such borrowing (comp. also Baur, p. 353), overlooks the fact that this method of designation must have been known from the teaching activity of the author.

true nature (I. iii. 8, 5), and thus was He glorified among the believers who acknowledged His glory (xi. 4, xvii. 10; comp. also note *a*).[10] Those who recognised His revelation confess now that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh (I. iv. 2; II. 7).[11] For the apostle everything depends on this coming of the Son of God in the flesh; for only thereby is the fact on which salvation is grounded, the fact, namely, that the Father hath sent the Son, become a matter of objective perception (I. iv. 14: *τεθεάμεθα*). But it is not thereby said that the divine Logos has clothed Himself only with an earthly material, mortal body (Köstlin, p. 139; Scholten, p. 94), far less than with an apparent body, which Baur, p. 364, finds in vi. 19, vii. 10, 15, viii. 59 (comp. on the other hand, my *joh. Lehrb.* p. 253 f.). To be sure, the body of Jesus is regarded as the temple (ii. 21) in which the divine Logos has made His dwelling, as Jehovah once found in the tabernacle a place

[10] As God, because He is a spirit, and therefore bound to no locality (iv. 24, 21), therefore cannot be seen with the bodily eye (i. 4, 12, 20), so naturally the Son of God also, because He is the divine Logos, and the nature of the Logos is self-evidently spiritual (comp. vi. 63), is not in Himself visible. Yet the eye-witnesses of the earthly life of Jesus testify that (in consequence of His manifestation of Himself and His miraculous works) His eternal Logos nature became (I. i. 1) capable of being heard and seen by them (notice the perfects: *ἀκηκόαμεν . . . ἑωράκαμεν*) when in the closest intercourse with Him (*αἱ χεῖρες ἡμῶν ἐψηλάφησαν*), being an object of their attentive contemplation *θεᾶσθαι*, as throughout in contradistinction from *ὁρᾶν*, from perception by the senses (comp. i. 32, 38, iv. 35, vi. 5, xi. 45, i. 4, 14).

[11] These expressions will not set forth the body of Jesus as a real body in contradistinction to a docetic one (comp. Lutterbeck, p. 277); they will rather prove that in the human person of Jesus, who was on that account called Jesus Christ (comp. footnote 1), the Christ or the eternal Son of God is come in the flesh, without our being capable on that account, with Gess, p. 509, to put *χριστόν* into the predicate (that He is the Christ come in the flesh), which is very doubtful on account of the want of the article. It opposes in that way the false teachers, who distinguished between the higher æon Christ and the human Jesus, and would concede only a temporary union between them (as Hilgenfeld, p. 244, imputes even to our author), and makes prominent as against them that He is come (by baptism) in water and (by His death) in blood (I. v. 6), and therefore even before baptism and even in death was He the Son of God manifested in the flesh. The *οὐκ ἐν τῷ ὕδατι μόνον* is simply explained in this way, that the false teachers could yet ascribe this in a certain sense, and *ἐν τῷ αἵματι* was specially decisive. Therewith falls the only reason which Gess, p. 518, can adduce against this the only interpretation conformable to the word and the fact; and that the reference to the baptism which Jesus introduced presupposes the most arbitrary assumptions, Gess, p. 519 f., shows clearly enough.

for His manifestation on the earth (i. 14: ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν). But the flesh, which forms the material substance of this body, is with John, as everywhere in the early apostolic system of doctrine, animated flesh, and the life of this flesh is not the bearer only of the physical, but also of the spiritual life in man (§ 27, *b*, *c*).[12] The Logos come in the flesh is therefore become man in the fullest sense (comp. also Biedermann, p. 255). It is not said that the Logos took flesh (which might, perhaps, be docetically misunderstood), but that the Logos became flesh (i. 14);[13] that He therefore became something else than He was before, as also the subject of the historical life of Jesus is never designated as the Logos, and a Logos *extra carnem* is never assumed alongside the Logos *in carne* (as Beyschlag, p. 173, would have it). As Logos the Son of God was a purely spiritual Being, and He became a Being in flesh, *i.e.* a Being who had the earthly material nature in His body, and can be on that account the object of bodily perception. The evangelist throughout speaks without reserve of His earthly home (i. 46, 47, vii. 41, 52; comp. iv. 44), of His mother and His brethren (ii. 1, 12, vii. 3, 10, xix. 25, 26; comp. i. 46, vi. 42). Then σάρξ is only that which is born of the flesh (iii. 6), and the

[12] To be sure, vi. 63, σάρξ forms only the earthly material body in opposition to the spiritual, and, viii. 15, κατὰ τὴν σάρκα, like κατ' ὄψιν (vii. 24), designates judging according to the outward, external appearance. But, i. 13, a θέλημα is ascribed to the σάρξ, which can only be the fleshly impulse by means of the soul (comp. I. ii. 16). Thus, too, a real human shuddering is ascribed to the soul of Christ; and if the same is elsewhere said of His spirit (xiii. 21, xi. 33), then this cannot be the πνεῦμα of the Logos (Köstlin, p. 141; Scholten, p. 113), but only the πνεῦμα constituting the human soul (§ 27, *c*). On the other hand, as little of the specifically Pauline σάρξ (§ 68) is found in John as anywhere in the early apostolic system of doctrine, as it has often yet without more ado been drawn in to iii. 6, where but the bodily birth, which conditions the earthly sensuous life, is contrasted with the spiritual second birth. The ἐπιθυμία τῆς σαρκός (I. ii. 16) is not the sinful lust as such, but the lust of the flesh in the narrower sense, as even its conjunction with the lust of the eye shows.

[13] The incarnation is not here to be described, which indeed (i. 9–12) is presupposed, since only He who has become flesh can come historically, be in the world, can be known and accepted. Rather from the context only those sides of it are to be made prominent by which a concrete beholding of the invisible Logos can come about (comp. Gess, p. 553). But if πᾶσα σάρξ designates every man, in so far as he is a fleshly nature (xvii. 2; comp. § 27, *a*), then σὰρξ ἐγένετο can but designate that He became a being whose characteristic peculiarity it is to have in Himself σάρξ.

Logos has become σάρξ.[14] But the identical subject of the original Logos-nature (Χριστός) and of the historical flesh-nature (Ἰησοῦς) is the only-begotten Son of God.

(*d*) In John, too, the Baptist testifies that he saw the Spirit descend on Jesus (i. 32, 33; comp. § 18, *a*); and Jesus seems Himself to refer to this consecration of the Spirit at His baptism (x. 36: ἡγίασεν).[15] Yet it is not to be overlooked, that the evangelist explains, iii. 34, even the communication of the Spirit narrated by the Baptist, according to his conception of i. 32, 33, in this way, that the Spirit comes down on Jesus not to unite Himself with Him, but to abide upon Him (μένον ἐπ' αὐτόν), *i.e.* in order to give Him steadily the miraculous help, and the knowledge of what He has to speak and to do according to the will of God (§ 144, *c*, *d*). In this sense the saying of Jesus, i. 52, is but another form of the idea of that constant equipment and strengthening for the exercise of the activity of His Messianic calling, of which the incarnate Logos stood in need just as did the Son of man of Christ's words who came down from heaven. To be sure,

[14] Since John knew and presupposed the Synoptic Gospels, it would be strange enough to ascribe to him, that he had to enter a protest if Jesus is spoken of in the mouths of the people as the son of Joseph of Nazareth, if he was not to be a witness against the miraculous birth at Bethlehem. For His incarnation the question whether He was naturally or supernaturally begotten makes no difference, as the incarnation depends on a fleshly birth as such.

[15] Neither is the Spirit the Logos, who in baptism is united with the man Jesus (comp. Hilgenfeld, p. 254 f.), nor is that descent of the Spirit set forth as a mere vision of the Baptist (comp. Baur, p. 366 f.), to indicate to him that Jesus from the first dwelt in the Spirit (Neander, p. 887; Messner, p. 366), or that it is He who is to communicate the Spirit (Köstlin, p. 144). For, apart from the fact that a token cannot designate anything strange or opposed to the thing designated, the Baptist designates Jesus as One who had actually received the Spirit only without measure (iii. 34). If, then, it is here referred to this communication of the Spirit, that He whom God sent speaks the words of God, then that seems, at any rate, to involve a contradiction to Jesus' testimony regarding Himself, according to which His higher knowledge comes from His prehistorical existence with the Father (§ 144, *a*), and to the doctrine built thereupon of the Logos, who appeared in the man Jesus, having become flesh, inasmuch as Jesus' activity in the execution of His calling is never traced back to His higher nature, but to the preparation of the Spirit, which is different from the prophetic only in degree. But, closely connected with this, the idea is put into the mouth of the Baptist, by which He, who came from above, has seen and heard what He has testified (vv. 31, 32), so in the consciousness of the evangelist the two ideas at least cannot have been felt to be contradictory.

it corresponds neither with the immediate unity of the Son with the Father (§ 143, *c*, *d*), which comes out so strongly in the self-testimony of Jesus, to think of the relation of both being mediated by the Spirit; nor could the apostle, with his tendency to point out the marks of His original glory as Logos given in the historical life of the Son of God (note *a*), have any interest in this to follow further the traces of His truly human life in the incarnate One, which made Him require such constant activity of the Spirit. Hence these doctrinal elements, that rest on a true remembrance of the words of the Baptist, or that have come to him by tradition, continue with him in a sort of isolation,—an isolation which almost makes them appear as a contradiction to the ideas current with Him, while they yet, although not expressly brought about by them, involve to his consciousness no such contradiction.

CHAPTER II.

THE SALVATION IN CHRIST.

§ 146. *Christ the Life of the World.*

As the Messiah, Jesus brings the highest saving blessing, which John designates as eternal life, and likes best to think of as now present (*a*). But eternal life consists in the living contemplative knowledge of God, as Christ has had it from eternity (*b*). To bring life to the world by means of this knowledge has He been sent, and He therefore calls Himself the bread of life (*c*). But He also imparts this life by His quickening word, whose contents form the powerfully energetic revelation of God (*d*).

(*a*) Even with John, Jesus begins with the proclamation that the kingdom of God is at hand, and it is now therefore important to fulfil the conditions under which only can one have a share in it (iii. 3, 5; comp. § 13). If the idea of the kingdom of God, as the saving blessing brought by Christ, falls latterly entirely in abeyance, and instead of it the idea of

life, or of eternal life, comes uniformly in its place,[1] then this latter, even in the oldest tradition of Jesus' words, designates the salvation prepared for the individual in the kingdom of God (§ 34, *b*); and it corresponds simply to the tendency of John's writings, directed as these are to the subjective Christian life (xx. 31; I. i. 3, 4), if, in the words of Christ, as in the Epistles, the highest blessing is brought forward exclusively from the side on which it is realized in the individual. But as in the synoptical preaching of Jesus the kingdom of God is not only future, but even already present (§ 15, *c*), so with John also is the eternal life, which the Messiah came to bring, not only a blessing of the other and future life, but also of this and the present life. The believer *has* eternal life (iii. 36, v. 24, vi. 47, 54, xx. 31; I. v. 12, 13), He has already passed from death to life (v. 24; I. iii. 14). Bodily death cannot stop the continuance of this life (xi. 25), for that life death is as though it did not exist (vi. 50, 51, 58, viii. 51, 52, xi. 26); the resurrection is no more the condition, but the result of that life (vi. 40, 54). What has till now been the highest promise of God has now been fulfilled (I. ii. 25). This idealism, which beholds the ideal already realized in the present, we have learned to know in manifold forms as the characteristic aspect of the method of apostolic teaching (§ 51, *c*; 96, *b*; 104, *d*; 117, *d*), but it is implied in the speciality of the Johannean theology (§ 141, *c*), that it here comes into stronger prominence than anywhere else.[2]

(*b*) If John had found in the contemplative knowledge of Christ, and of the revelation of God given in Him, the highest

[1] Only in xviii. 36 does Jesus speak of *His* kingdom, which is not of a worldly kind; but here there is no thought of the Messianic kingdom, but He has only in view thereby an explanation for the Gentile, in which sense Jesus might call Himself a king in a spiritual kingdom, which comprehends all friends of the truth. By John, ζωή in the absolute sense, and ζωὴ αἰώνιος, are constantly used promiscuously (iii. 36, v. 39, 40, vi. 53, 54; I. i. 2, iii. 14, 15, v. 11-13), as § 34, *b* (comp. in Paul, § 65, *d*).

[2] Since Col. iii. 3 is quite different (comp. § 104, *d*), so only in John is eternal life, according to its true nature, thought of as beginning here, and it forms thereby the specific saving blessing. What Peter proclaimed as the second birth to hope (§ 50, *b*), what James as the engrafting of the perfect law (§ 52, *b*), what Paul as justification and new creation by the grace of God (§ 82, 84), what the Epistle to the Hebrews as the τελείωσις in the New Covenant (§ 123), in order to characterize the salvation come with Christ for the individual, that appears in John as the bestowal of the highest blessing by Him, eternal life.

blessedness (§ 141, *b*), then must he too see in it the eternal life, which the Messiah had come to bring. That is eternal life, to know the only true God, and Jesus Christ His messenger (xvii. 3), he says in a passage where it was important to show by a convincing explanation of the eternal life how the communication of it (ver. 2) must tend to the glory of God (ver. 1).[3] This highest saving blessing was not only not yet given to the world, it was not even as yet once made known to it. It is true that elsewhere the thought is not foreign to the New Testament, that in the vision of God the highest blessedness of eternal life lies in the future world (§ 34, *b*; 99, *b*; 126, *d*; 132, *d*); but there was as yet awanting any view to show how eternal blessed life was given with this vision of God. But now the Son of God was come, who possessed this highest good; for He had said of Himself, that the Father had given to Him to have life in Himself, as He Himself only had it in Himself (v. 26, vi. 57). As an eternal life was this life made known to the eye-witnesses of His earthly walk (I. i. 2: *ἡ ζωὴ ἐφανερώθη . . . καὶ ἀπαγγέλλομεν ὑμῖν τὴν ζωὴν τὴν αἰώνιον*), as He had testified of it as a life from the very beginning (*ὃ ἦν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς*: ver. 1), and therefore also as a life not to be lost, and as a blessed life, as it was led in living fellowship with the Father (*ἥτις ἦν πρὸς τὸν πατέρα*: ver. 2; comp. John i. 1, 2); but what was the essential contents of this life is clear from this, that He had again and again pointed back to this, how He had beheld God in His original existence with the Father, and He traced His peculiar knowledge of God back to this beholding Him (§ 144, *a*).[4] But even in His earthly life all

[3] In xvii. 6 the *ἐγώ σε ἐδόξασα* of ver. 4 is resumed by *ἐφανέρωσά σου τὸ ὄνομα*, so that here too the glory of God consists in bringing about the true knowledge of God. Since eternal life is undoubtedly thought of as spiritual, it was natural for John throughout to regard this moment in the spiritual life as the real nature of it,—a moment which, according to his individuality, generally appeared to him as the ruling central-point of the total spiritual life, and in which he had experienced the deepest deliverance from his spiritual needs through Christ, had found and laid hold on the highest salvation.

[4] Ordinarily the "hypostatized" (?) *ζωή* in I. i. 1 is understood of Christ Himself by a reference to John i. 1; but ver. 1 by no means proves this, but rather the opposite, since the words there do *not* refer to the person, but to *what* (*ὅ*) was experimentally made known to the eye-witnesses of the earthly life of Christ in and about this life. But this is nothing else than the true eternal life which

the blessedness of the eternal life seemed already realized. A life in uninterrupted fellowship with His Father, whose highest satisfaction was the fulfilling of His will (iv. 34); a life full of peace (xiv. 27) and joy (xv. 11, xvii. 13), such as the world cannot give nor take away (comp. xvi. 33); a life which is ended by a going home to the Father, as it began with a coming down from heaven,—that was eternal blessed life even here. And what formed the deepest essence of this life could be but the one thing, which He always testified He had had before all others—His matchless, intuitive, perfect knowledge of God.

(*c*) Christ had come as the Messiah to impart this highest good to men. God has given us eternal life, and that life is in His Son (I. v. 11). Christ Himself, therefore, calls Himself the life, *i.e.* the life-giver (xi. 25, xiv. 6; comp. I. v. 20);[5] and the apostle, who had recognised Him as the incarnate Word, calls Him the Word needful for life (I. i. 1: ὁ λόγος τῆς ζωῆς), because it cannot give life without the

from the beginning was in Him (John i. 4), which exhibited therefore His original existence with the Father not as a restful quiescent, but as a living activity. Only the constant movement of His life did not consist in this, that He sought to take up everything which separated and distinguished Him from God into a unity with Him, as Baur, p. 352, philosophizes into it; but in this, that He beheld the Father, as the Father beholds Himself. It is characteristic of John's spiritual tendency, that while elsewhere in the Scriptures the living activity of God is the expression for His powerful activity in the world, here the living Father (vi. 57), according to the analogy of that which elsewhere the apostle regarded as the deepest nature of the true life, is in the first place He who beholds Himself in the depths of His self-consciousness. The true life is even a spiritual one, which cannot be thought of without this self-consciousness. But while a Paul brings forward especially the side on the divine πνεῦμα, according to which it is simply the effectual power (§ 84, *a*, footnote 4), it appears here especially from its intellectual side, which is, to be sure, conceived by John throughout in immediate unity with the practical (comp. § 141, *d*).

[5] From this also it is clear that the οὗτος can apply only to Christ, since nowhere else is God called ζωή. God has life in Himself (v. 26, vi. 57), but the Mediator of life can only be Christ, of whom it is said in the beginning of the verse that He is come to give us the power to know God, in which eternal life consists. That was, indeed, the object of His mission, that He might communicate to the world life (I. iv. 9; comp. John vi. 40, x. 10) in Him (iii. 15: read ἐν αὐτῷ) or in His name (xx. 31), *i.e.* if we know Him as He whom His name designates (χριστός = ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ; comp. § 145, *a*), we have eternal life. That was, indeed, the full Messianic power given Him (comp. § 143, *b*) to give eternal life to all flesh (xvii. 2), and this life consists in the knowledge of the one true God mediated by Him (ver. 3).

mediator of revelation. As now the simplest means of nourishment which supports the physical life is bread, Christ calls Himself the bread necessary for life (vi. 35, 48: ὁ ἄρτος τῆς ζωῆς), or the bread which gives life to the world (vi. 33, 50, 58).[6] But He is this, because He is the perfect revelation of God (§ 143, *d*); because the Father is seen in Him (xiv. 9), and known (viii. 19); because we have the Father in Him (I. ii. 23; II. 9), who can be seen and possessed as the highest good in Him. In this way is the seeing of God possible to the world, a seeing which the Son once had with the Father, and which includes in itself eternal life, the highest blessedness. The true knowledge of God, in which this life consists, presupposes throughout such a seeing of God (xiv. 7, 17; I. iii. 6). This seeing is not a higher stage of knowledge (Frommann, p. 223); according to § 141, *b*, John knows only of an intuitive knowledge, which is a spiritual seeing, and this knowledge can therefore be designated as the true life, just because it is no theoretical knowledge, but a living, *i.e.* an effectual grasping of the highest; according to its nature, the whole life is a determinative object of knowledge. A pretended knowledge of God, which does not regulate the life, is a lie (I. ii. 4), it in truth does not exist (I. iii. 6, iv. 8; III. 11); only in its working on the moral life does one know the true knowledge (I. ii. 3), and that one has attained in it, and with it, the true life out of death (I. iii. 14).

(*d*) But the Son, sent by the Father, is not a dead organ of revelation, not a means of life such as (physical) bread, which can indeed work life, but has not itself life in itself; He is the living bread (vi. 51), inasmuch as the living Father has given Him, with a view to His mission, to have life in Himself (vi. 57, v. 26). He Himself possessed the life of the knowledge of God, which He had to communicate by His self-manifestation (note *c*), and He could therefore make known God's name (xvii. 6, 26). He needed but to com-

[6] Even according to the oldest tradition, Jesus, by His appearance, gives satisfaction and quickening to the world (§ 21, *d*; comp. § 46, *c*); and if this is there found in the moral renewal wrought by the saving preaching of Jesus, we will see that here the true knowledge of God communicated by Christ directly settles and renews the whole life.

municate what He had seen with the Father (viii. 38), the heavenly things which He who came from heaven alone knew (iii. 12, 13). He thus glorified the Father, while He made known His glorious Being to men (xii. 28, xiii. 31, xvii. 4; comp. xiv. 13, xv. 18). Looked at from this side, the means of revelation which procures for the world the true knowledge of God is His word, which He hence designates as the living water (iv. 10, 14, vii. 37, 38; comp. § 132, *d*, footnote 6), as the imperishable food (vi. 27). As He is Himself the bread necessary for life (I. i. 1), so His words are words of eternal life (vi. 68); as He is Himself the author of life (xi. 25, xiv. 6), so are His words ζωή (vi. 63), and the preaching commissioned to Him ζωὴ αἰώνιος (xii. 49, 50). But the contents of His word are, to be sure, with John mainly Himself again, *i.e.* the meaning of the revelation given in His person and His works (note *c*).[7]

§ 147. *Christ the Light of the World.*

As He who brings the true knowledge of God, Christ is the light of the world (*a*). As such He brings the full knowledge of the truth which determines the whole life, and is given with the knowledge of the Father in the Son (*b*). But the specific contents of the new revelation of God in Christ is comprehended in this, that God is love (*c*).

(*a*) Even in the oldest tradition Jesus represents Himself as the giver of the true knowledge of God, who brings to men, therefore, the light (in the spiritual sense, § 20, *a*). But this side of Jesus' activity has to be specially brought forward in John; for if the highest saving blessing, or the true life, consists in knowledge, then to obtain this life is there

[7] In the word of Christ, too, there is no lack of ἐντολαί (xiii. 34, xiv. 15, 21, xv. 10); but this commanding side of His proclamation does not here come into such prominence as in the synoptical tradition (§ 21, *b*), because to the Johannean view true knowledge directly of itself determines the life, and inasmuch as His word is but the proclamation of a new revelation of God, it even at the same time contains within itself an ἐντολή, which of itself works out its fulfilment, and it works, therefore, to purify (xv. 3; comp. xiii. 10) and to determine the whole moral life. But this it does also in the oldest tradition of the words of Jesus (§ 21, *c*), as the general early apostolic view of doctrine coincides with this, according to which the moral new birth is referred to the word of evangelical preaching (§ 46, 52, 128).

required a means of enlightenment. The light which this knowledge brings about, is the light pertaining to life (viii. 12: τὸ φῶς τῆς ζωῆς). He only, who Himself has this knowledge, can communicate it to others; only the life of the true knowledge of God, which was in the Logos, could be the light of men (i. 4: ἡ ζωή, *scil.* ἡ ἐν αὐτῷ ἦν, ἦν τὸ φῶς τῶν ἀνθρώπων).[1] As, therefore, the sun, which brings light to the world in the physical sense, is called its light (xi. 9), so Jesus calls Himself the light, *i.e.* the light-giver, to the world in the spiritual sense (viii. 12, ix. 5, xii. 35, 36, 46; comp. Matt. v. 14). Whoever enters into connection with this light-giver (ἔρχεται πρὸς τὸ φῶς) has his whole being thereby laid bare (iii. 19–21); whoever follows Him does not walk in darkness, because He has a light which shows him the way (viii. 12; comp. I. i. 6), whereas in the darkness one does not see whither one comes in his wandering ways (xii. 35; comp. I. ii. 11); he is a child of the light (xii. 36), *i.e.* one enlightened (comp. Luke xvi. 8; Eph. v. 8). On the ground of this self-testimony, the apostle designates the incarnate Logos as the true light which has come into the world (i. 9), and now, not conquered by the darkness (ver. 5), which it is rather ever more conquering (I. ii. 8), it shines in the world. The result of which is, that God, who hitherto was hid in impenetrable darkness, so that He could be seen by no one, now stands before us in the clear light of revelation (I. i. 7), nay, is light itself, *i.e.* has come to be through and through knowable, so that nothing dark or unknowable remains any more in Him (ver. 5).[2] But, inasmuch as all

[1] Gess, p. 545, "prefers indeed" by the life "to understand the Logos containing life in Himself;" but ἡ ζωή with the article can refer only to the life of which it has just been said that it was in the Logos, and for the idea of the life simply to substitute that of the Logos is naturally pure arbitrariness. Comp. my *joh. Lehrb.* pp. 38–41.

[2] To refer this sentence, which, to be sure, according to Kübel, p. 23, is to say (!) nothing specific about the new message, to the holiness of God (comp. Messner, p. 346) is impossible, since the holiness of God is already revealed in the Old Testament, and cannot be the specific content of the apostolic ἀγγελία. If it is said that this truth represents the essential basis of Christianity (comp. Huther *in loc.*), then our assertion is but confirmed, since that which is the basis (*i.e.* the presupposition) of the proclamation of the Christian salvation *cannot* be its contents. The latter interpretation of φῶς has, moreover, no support in Biblical symbolical language (comp. my *joh. Lehrbegriff*, pp. 42–45),

true knowledge must necessarily determine the whole life (§ 146, *c*), the fact of a man's being enlightened (*ἐν τῷ φωτὶ εἶναι* or *περιπατεῖν*; comp. I. i. 7) must be known in his moral walk (I. ii. 9–11).

(*b*) All true knowledge is but a knowledge of the truth, as such knowledge is the characteristic quality of Christians (I. ii. 21; II. 1; comp. § 107, *a*). If Christ, therefore, is to be the communicator of the life which consists in true knowledge, then must He be the communicator of the truth (xiv. 6: *ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ ἀλήθεια καὶ ἡ ζωή*). For this end indeed has He come, that He may witness to the world of the truth (xviii. 37; comp. viii. 40). But by the truth John by no means understands the sum of all that which is true, but the actual reality of what we know of God from revelation (comp. § 65, *b*, footnote 3), therefore the revelation of the *ἀληθινός* (I. v. 20).[3] If the Logos incarnate in Jesus was Himself full of truth (i. 14), and could therefore communicate the truth to the world (ver. 17), then is this expressly declared, ver. 18, in this way, that He, who as the only-begotten Son stands in the highest fellowship of love with the Father, alone could show to the world His nature, which had been seen by none up till then. Just because the divine nature, which (when really known) of itself exercises a determining power over the

and it makes the parallel clause say nothing at all; nay, in so far as it would deny the existence of any unholiness in God, it is almost a blasphemous tautology. On the other hand, we have here a natural turn of the symbolism already current in the Old Testament (comp. Isa. xlix. 6, and therewith Acts xiii. 47; Luke ii. 32) and in Paul (§ 102, *a*, footnote 1, *d*), on which the figurative expression explained above rests. Light is the means of enlightenment (in the physical world), and therefore the image of the organ of revelation (in the spiritual world); but it is also, according to its nature, that which makes itself evident, and therefore the image of God perfectly revealing Himself in Christ. When Huther asserts that by this interpretation of the passage *ἐν Χριστῷ* is naturally supplied, then even the evangelical proclamation, according to vv. 1–3, treats only of Christ, and it can be intended only to tell of what is given in and with Him.

[3] *Ἀλήθεια* is by no means knowledge, but the object of knowledge, and it is not therefore identical with *ζωή* (rightly understood), but the revelation of the truth is the presupposition of it. *Ἀλήθεια* also frequently stands for that which perfectly corresponds to the nature of the thing designated (*ἡγιασμένοι ἐν ἀληθείᾳ*: xvii. 9; *ἀγαπᾶν ἐν ἀληθείᾳ*: I. iii. 18; II. 1; III. 1; *προσκυνεῖν ἐν ἀληθείᾳ*: iv. 23, 24; comp. II. 4; III. 3), and which is elsewhere designated by the adjective *ἀληθινός* (i. 9, iv. 23, 37, vi. 32, vii. 28, xv. 1, xvii. 3, xix. 35; I. ii. 8; comp. Rev. iii. 7, 14, vi. 10). Comp. vi. 55: *ἀληθὴς βρῶσις*.

life (§ 146, *c*), is itself the contents of the truth, the truth has the power to deliver from the bondage of sin (viii. 32; comp. vv. 34, 36), and to work a life consecrated to God (xvii. 17).[4] That is to say, God is here also, in conformity with His nature, as well δίκαιος, inasmuch as He does right at all times (I. ii. 29), and gives to each what is due to him; therefore, *e.g.*, true to His promise, He forgives sin to the penitent sinner (I. i. 9), as He is the simply holy (I. ii. 20), as in the Apocalypse (§ 133, *a*).[5] It is true that His righteousness and holiness have been already revealed in the Old Testament; but in Christ the righteous One (I. ii. 1; comp. xvi. 10), who was pure from all sin (I. iii. 5, 3: ἁγνός; comp. viii. 46), is that revelation come to full, living view. As in the synoptical speeches of Jesus His self-manifestation in His walk appears to be for our example (§ 21, *d*), so is it here too (I. ii. 6, iii. 3). The knowledge of Christ as the sinless One is of itself normative for our walk, which in that

[4] Hence that state of being inwardly determined by the truth (appropriated in knowledge), the ἐκ τῆς ἀληθείας εἶναι, is known not only in all denial of the false (I. ii. 21¼; comp. i. 8), but also in the moral conduct of the individual (I. iii. 19; comp. ii. 4). Hence a walk in the truth (III. 4), or a doing of the truth (iii. 21; I. i. 6), can be spoken of. The truth is therefore here, too, a moral principle, as with Paul (§ 65, *b*, footnote 3); but not inasmuch as its contents are the revealed will of God as there, but inasmuch as the true knowledge of God is necessarily determinative of the (moral) life. Closely allied to this, ἀλήθεια stands for subjective truthfulness (viii. 44; I. i. 8; comp. ἀληθής: viii. 26, iii. 33–v. 31, 32, vii. 18, viii. 13–17, xix. 35, xxi. 24; III. 12).

[5] The current reference of τοῦ ἁγίου to Christ (yet comp. Gess, p. 525), which, however, is not to be proved by the equally doubtful αὐτοῦ in ver. 27, is contradicted by the fact that Christ, while we have John vi. 69: ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ, is never called the Holy One simply. There is no need of the artificial explanation by τὸ ἅγιον (Ritschl, ii. p. 101, footnote), since the reason why God is here designated as the Holy One is clearly this, that He only as such can consecrate Christians with the unction to be His own holy possession. Just so is He, John xvii. 11, addressed as πάτερ ἅγιε, when what is dealt with is that He, who has separated Himself from all creaturely uncleanness (comp. § 45, *d*, footnote 6), should preserve the disciples, that they may not be misled and polluted by the world. But if He is addressed, ver. 25, as πάτερ δίκαιε, the reference then is not simply to the perfecting of the salvation of the disciples (Ritschl, p. 117), but expressly to this, that He, in virtue of His judicial righteousness, awards to believers a different destiny than to the world which has not known Him (comp. v. 30, vii. 24, viii. 50); I. i. 9, too, does not speak of retribution, but of this, that He deals with penitent sinners as such (comp. Immer, p. 542). On the other hand, there is nothing in the passage to refer to any struggle after complete justification, a struggle in which the righteous Judge gives help (Gess, p. 523 f.).

way must be a sinless walk (I. iii. 5, 6) as soon as Christ is known as what He is, the sent of God (xvii. 3, 23), who is everlasting like God Himself (I. ii. 13, 14), who, having come out from the Father (xvii. 8), in His abiding unity with Him (x. 38) reveals the Father (xiv. 9), so that one has the Father in Him (comp. I. ii. 23; II. 9). Because this knowledge of the mission of Christ is the condition of that knowledge of the truth which delivers and transforms, it there forms the direct contrast to the not knowing of God (xvii. 25); for he only who has known God has known Him (viii. 19).

(*c*) But Christ also brings a *new* revelation of God.[6] What is revealed in the sending of the only-begotten Son, in whom God has given up the highest object of His love for the salvation of men, is expressly designated, I. iv. 9, 10, as the love of God (comp. John iii. 16, 17), the love which on that account is named, I. iv. 16, as the object of Christian knowledge (xvii. 23).[7] The apostle comprehends the whole contents of this new revelation of God in the sentence, God is love (I. iv. 8, 16); and the knowledge of this Being, who reveals Himself in love, shows itself to be livingly effective, inasmuch as it necessarily begets love in us (vv. 11, 19). That the sending of the Son, who introduces the Messianic

[6] This, to be sure, does not consist in new disclosures about God's transcendent being (Scholten, p. 77). It does not therefore teach us to know that He is to be thought of as a spiritual and invisible Being, yet as absolute activity (Baur, pp. 354–356, 403, after v. 17), or that He is life, as Frommann, p. 91; Köstlin, p. 75; Reuss, ii. p. 434 [E. T. ii. 388], conclude from I. v. 20, although these passages, according to § 145, *b*, footnote 5; 146, *c*, footnote 5, do not apply to God that He is light, as they assume, following the misunderstood passage, I. i. 5 (comp. footnote 2), or that He is a spirit, which Frommann, p. 101; Köstlin, p. 77, find in iv. 24. In the latter passage Jesus appeals to a knowledge of God which was common to Jews and Samaritans, as even Reuss, ii. p. 433 [E. T. ii. 387], acknowledges, but which ought, like all true knowledge, to prove itself effectual in this way, that we recognise Him as a spiritual Being, and worship Him in a spiritual way (iv. 23, 24); comp. also Biedermann, p. 172.

[7] The knowledge of this new revelation of God, after it has once come, is so much the measure for all knowledge of God, that Jesus directly denies that those have any knowledge of God who will not know Him as the only-begotten Son sent of the Father (vii. 28, viii. 19, 55, xv. 21, xvi. 3). All the great miraculous works which God did in Him are, indeed, if they are looked on, according to § 143, *b*, as pictures of the highest spiritual blessings, nothing but revelations of the divine love, which shows itself in the Messianic times by the fulness of its distributions of grace (comp. § 20, *d*).

time, implies the perfect revelation of the love of God, is not alien even to the oldest tradition of Jesus' speeches, only it is rather implicitly involved there in the proclamation of God as the Father of the members of the kingdom (§ 20); as He who is here also manifested (I. ii. 15, 16; comp. iv. 21, 23, xx. 17), inasmuch as His giving (I. iii. 1) and forgiving love (I. ii. 1, 13) is sure to them.[8] But there, too, it is the revelation of the Father's love which moves His children to be like Him in love (§ 25, *a*). And not merely by the fact of the sending of the Son, and all its blessed results for us, by which it is perfected according to I. iv. 17, is the love of God revealed to us; but since here, too, the Father is seen in the Son, the highest divine love is known directly in the love of Christ Himself (I. iii. 16; comp. xv. 9, 13); and as Christ does in the synoptical tradition (§ 25, *d*), so here, too, He presents His own humbly ministering love (xiii. 14, 15), His self-sacrificing love (xiii. 34, xv. 12; comp. I. iii. 16), to be a pattern to us. Here also, as note *b*, the revelation of God given in the exhibition of Himself is determinative for our moral life.

§ 148. *Christ the Saviour of the World.*

The other side of the Messianic work is salvation from the destruction into which the world, on account of sin, falls at

[8] Just so is the beginning of the fulfilment of the Messianic promise regarded by Peter as a gift of the divine favour (§ 45, *b*), and in the Epistle to the Hebrews the favour and the grace of God are again turned towards His people by the setting up of the New Covenant (§ 124, *a*). With Paul also the love of God is the ground and result of the new institution of grace (§ 75, *c*; 83, *a*), and it is a mistake when Baur, p. 400, says that the Johannean doctrinal idea is distinguished from the Pauline; that in the former the love of God is the highest idea, while in the latter righteousness stands over against it. For even in John the Old Testament revelation of righteousness not only abides, but it is perfected in Christ (note *b*), as Christianity to him forms no antithesis to Old Testament Judaism (§ 141, *a*). Undoubtedly the apostle of love has seen (§ 141, *d*) most clearly and deeply the perfect revelation of God in Christ in His revelation of love. And if from here we look back to the statement that no one has seen the Father except through Christ, it is clearly evident from these contents of the perfect revelation of God, that it results from no metaphysical speculation about the unknowableness of God (comp. Reuss, iii. p. 430 f. [E. T. ii. 384]), but that it is the necessary result of this, that the highest blessing is given only in the Messianic times, and through the Messiah—the highest good which the apostle has regarded as that beholding of the love of God.

death (*a*). This comes about in this way, that Jesus, atoning for the world's sin, purifies men from the stains of guilt by His blood (*b*). Only when the world has been delivered from death by His giving up His life, can it receive eternal life in the other world (*c*). But even in the specifically Johannean sense does the death of Jesus, as the highest manifestation of love, bring eternal life (*d*).

(*a*) The Johannean speeches of Jesus, like those of the Synoptists (§ 22, *a*), start from this idea, that the Messiah had to bring not only the consummation of salvation, but also deliverance (iii. 17, xii. 47; comp. v. 34, x. 9), and they presuppose the idea of *σωτηρία* as one well known (iv. 22), so that in the deliverance expected in Messianic times, only a deliverance from destruction or from death can be thought of. Whoever dies in his sins (viii. 21, 24) is lost; unforgiven sin leads to death (I. v. 16).[1] Doubtless it corresponds to his idea of an eternal life already present (§ 146, *a*), that John, on the other hand, designates the destruction which sin brings with it directly as death (comp. moreover, even § 28, *c*), from which believers even now pass to life (v. 24), while sinners abide in it (I. iii. 14). But the definite distinction begins only after bodily death, since we are delivered from it only by the resurrection (vi. 39), while those who do not attain to salvation pass away without hope in Him (I. ii. 17). To be sure, the positive idea comes now with John into the forefront, by which, to those who have already received the highest good, eternal life, bodily death has *ipso facto* lost all significance (comp. § 146, *a*); but it lies in the nature of the fact, that the man, who by the divine judgment has fallen under death,

[1] Our apostle has then kept fast hold of the idea of the *σωτηρία* rooted in the Old Testament, and recurring in all the New Testament types of doctrine, and for him the Son sent by the Father, or the Messiah, is the Saviour of the world (iv. 42; I. iv. 14). To him, too, this deliverance is a deliverance from destruction (*ἀπώλεια*: xvii. 12), since *μὴ ἀπολέσθαι* and *σωθῆναι* (iii. 16, 17) are convertible terms, or a saving the soul from destruction (xii. 25; comp. § 34, c). He also shares, with the whole New Testament teaching (§ 50, *d*; 57, *d*; 66, *d*; 122, *d*), the Old Testament view, according to which death, and that even bodily death, is the punishment of sin, which Frommann, p. 308, in vain denies. As little, moreover, does he deny the idea that bodily diseases are the results of sin (§ 32, *d*, footnote 4). This idea is combated, ix. 3, only in a particular instance; but v. 14, on the other hand, presupposes it in the clearest way.

cannot receive that life, that therefore deliverance from death must go alongside of participation in life.

(*b*) John has by no means formed any new theory of redemption, as Frommann, pp. 450–454, and Köstlin, p. 182, ascribe to him, but he here directly connects himself, out and out, with the current apostolic type of doctrine. The assertion, that the evangelist sets forth with peculiar emphasis Jesus as the true passover Lamb, falls of itself no doubt, if the day fixed by him for the death of Jesus is historically correct, and if xix. 36, as is most likely by far, is to be referred to the passage Ps. xxxiv. 20. But the word of the Baptist about the Lamb of God (i. 29), a word safely handed down in its fundamental principle, does not refer to the Passover lamb (yet comp. Scholten, p. 134; Schenkel, p. 384), but to the mute, patient lamb of Isa. liii. 7 (comp. Ritschl, ii. p. 68); yet the evangelist already explained the idea, borrowed certainly originally from Isa. liii. 11, in this way, that the servant of God, by His suffering (of death), takes away the sin of the world (comp. I. iii. 5).[2] The way in which this takes place he explains substantially in this way, that he designates Christ as the author of atonement for our sins (*ἱλασμὸς περὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν*: I. ii. 2, iv. 10), by which His death is evidently conceived of under the aspect of a sin-offering (Lev. vi. 23, v. 16, 18; comp. *κρίος τοῦ ἱλασμοῦ*: Num. v. 8); His blood has atoning power, and purifies from all stain of guilt (I. i. 7, 9; comp. 123, *a*; 134, *a*).[3] In particular,

[2] We find the figure of the lamb of Isaiah in Peter and in Revelation (§ 38, *d*; 49, *a*; 134, *a*). But *αἴρειν*, according to I. iii. 5, and the ordinary Johannean *usus loquendi*, can be understood only in the sense of taking away, and not in that of "taking on Himself to take away" (Gess, p. 522). But it refers not to the deliverance from an immoral nature (Baur, p. 396; Schenkel, p. 387), but to the taking away of the guilt of sin, as even the plural in I. iii. 5 shows, because it refers to past sins, which load us with guilt. Only ver. 6 speaks of the way in which the revelation of Christ as the sinless One works also actual holiness in us.

[3] To refer *καθαρίζειν* to deliverance from sin itself (comp. Schenkel, p. 386, who, however, speaks of a sacrifice of purification !), or to that along with other purposes (Gess, p. 522), is contrary to the text, inasmuch as it deals with the past sins (ver. 10) of those who have sin (I. i. 8; comp. ix. 41, xv. 22, 24, xix. 11) generally, past sins which are acknowledged as such (ver. 9), and which stain men with guilt. For the idea of *ἱλασμός*, comp. Ritschl, ii. p. 208, and Gess, p. 516, who, however, in an incomprehensible way, denies that by this covering for sin Christ is thought of as a sin-offering; while Reuss, ii. p. 495

quite as in the Epistle to the Hebrews, the sin-offering of the great day of atonement is thought of (Lev. xxiii. 27, 28, xxv. 9: ἡμέρα ἐξιλασμοῦ), since here, as there, the Son of God, as the sinless (I. iii. 5, ii. 1; comp. § 119, *b*) high priest, takes away sin, while He consecrates Himself as an offering, in order to put men in truth into the position of unstained holiness (xvii. 19; comp. § 121, *a*; 123, *b*); and as the intercessor with the Father (παράκλητος: I. ii. 1), He makes good before the Father the forgiveness obtained (ver. 2) by His atonement (§ 121, *c*).[4] Believers have forgiveness of sins for His name's sake, who designates Him as the ἱλασμός and παράκλητος (I. ii. 12; comp. i. 9).

(*c*) Inasmuch as Jesus atones for sin by His blood poured out in death, and thereby delivers the world from the destruction which death brings on the sinner, He dies for the good of (ὑπέρ) men (xi. 51, 52);[5] and the apostle interprets the word of Caiaphas as a prophecy by which one has to die, so that the whole nation may not perish (xi. 50; comp. xviii. 14). As, according to § 22, *c*, Jesus gives His life to be a λύτρον, so does He present Himself as the Good Shepherd, x. 11, 14, who gives His life for the good of the sheep, and that they may not become the prey of the wolf, may not fall into condemnation (ver. 12), *i.e.* that they may not lose their soul in death (xii. 25). In this sense Jesus gives His flesh (in death) for the life of the world (vi. 51). As meat and drink sustain life, so His flesh and blood, which seem to be so separated by a violent death (§ 27, *b*), become the means by which the world, which has fallen under abiding death, is maintained

[E. T. ii. 443], and Schenkel, p. 386, footnote 11, combat any reference of ἱλασμός to atonement and reconciliation.

[4] The peculiar connection in which I. i. 7, cleansing by the blood of the Son of God, is introduced with the κοινωνία, reminds one of the way of looking on it as the blood of the covenant (§ 22, *c*; 49, *c*; 121, *d*), only that this way of looking at it is not followed out. Only in Christian fellowship (κοινωνίαν ἔχομεν μετ' ἀλλήλων καὶ κ.τ.λ.) has any one a share in the Messianic saving blessing of purification from sin by the blood of Christ, and the connection with ver. 6 teaches that we can have fellowship with God only thus, with whom indeed no one stained with sin can enter into full covenant fellowship.

[5] In the second half of xi. 52 the gathering together the children of God from among the Gentiles is not an effect of the death of Jesus, but the intended result of it, inasmuch as it is conditioned by the exaltation of Jesus from the bonds of the earthly life (comp. xii. 24).

in life (vi. 55). In both images there is nothing said of any bearing of punishment, but of a service of love, which Jesus discharges to the world by giving His life, while He thereby delivers it from death and keeps it in life. But it is natural not to think here of life in the specifically Johannean sense (§ 146, as Köstlin, p. 183, does), but of eternal life in the current sense (v. 39; comp. § 34, *b*), which begins after the resurrection (ver. 29), and confers blessing for ever (iv. 14, 36, vi. 27).[6] To be sure, he who even here possesses eternal life has, as is self-evident, eternal life in this sense; but he could not have it, unless to the salvation given him in Christ, a salvation which gives him the former (§ 146), there was also connected deliverance from death through His death, who took away from us our guilt (note *b*), and therefore made the communication of life in the former sense possible (note *a*).

(*d*) One can only be struck by the way in which, at times in passages in which Christ's death is spoken of along with life in the other world, a life which seems especially to be the fruit of that death, eternal life in this life is also spoken of, the reception of which, to be sure, is also made possible by that death, but it is brought about apparently in quite a different way. Thus is it between vi. 51 and ver. 55, according to which Christ's death works life in the eternal sense, irrespective of the true life in this world preceding the resurrection, a true life which is obtained directly by the appropriation of Jesus' bloody death (vv. 53, 54); thus the eternal life which, according to iii. 14, 16, is produced by Jesus' death, is evidently regarded, ver. 15, as a life possessed immediately by faith.[7] But this is explained in this way,

[6] It is clear, vi. 58, that the eternal life which the eating the bread of life in the sense of vv. 51, 55 gives, forms the contrast to the dying of the patriarchs. In this sense life follows, xii. 25, on the resurrection, and stands, I. v. 16, in contrast to death, as eternal life, x. 28, stands in contrast to destruction (comp. ver. 10), in which God's wrath abides on men (iii. 36). In this sense the raising on the cross, typically foreshadowed by the brazen serpent (Num. xxi. 8, 9), brings about the obtaining eternal life (iii. 14, 15), which, ver. 16, forms the express contrast to destruction (comp. xii. 25). Only by a very forced exegesis can we bring these passages to the specifically Johannean idea of eternal life, as the attempt of Reuss, ii. p. 551 [E. T. ii. 494], sufficiently shows.

[7] In I. v. 16, life, in contrast with death as the punishment of sin, is spoken of, although plainly (vv. 11–13) he had been speaking of life in the specifically Johannean sense. But this is easily explained there, because the knowledge,

that the death of Christ is but the climax of the revelation of the love of God (in the sense of § 147, *c*), whether one now regard it as the necessary consequence of the gift of the only-begotten Son for the salvation of the world, as that deliverance could be achieved only in that way, or as the fulfilment of the divine loving will (x. 17, 18), which gave Him this cup (xviii. 11). Just so is it the climax of this revelation of love, in so far as it is seen in the love of the Son, which shows itself in the sacrificial death in the most striking way (xv. 13; I. iii. 16). In this sense the death of Christ is connected with His self-manifestation, which brings about the new revelation of God, as without it full salvation (eternal life) would not be objectively procured, and therefore the love of God would not be perfectly revealed; so thus without its subjective appropriation the revelation of God cannot be perfectly known, and therefore eternal life cannot in this life be perfectly obtained. From this point of view His death is the highest glorifying of God (xii. 28; comp. xvii. 4, xiii. 31, 32), as it is the highest glorifying of Christ Himself.[8]

which is the true life, strictly excludes sins (§ 146, *c*); where these nevertheless enter, life can be restored only through the victory over them. Similarly, iii. 36, to continue under the wrath of God is regarded as the contrast to eternal life, because unbelief, which excludes life, is there regarded as disobedience to the divine demand of faith (I. iii. 23). It creates no difficulty, finally, if, according to x. 9, 10, he who has been delivered by Jesus from destruction finds pastures which afford him true nourishment in the positive sense. Thus the reason of this double sense of ζωή lies in this, that John has taken the one from the current apostolic doctrinal of speech, but has coined the other independently (comp. § 141, *a*); so little reason can there be in this, accordingly, to speak of "unclear thinking" or of "uttering himself," since it is throughout clearly intelligible of what life he speaks.

[8] Only one must not, with Baur, pp. 379–381, find the latter indicated in a twofold signification of ὑψοῦσθαι (iii. 14, viii. 28, xii. 32), or in the sense of δοξάζεσθαι (xii. 23, xiii. 31), since the former points to His exaltation to heaven, which was brought about by His death; but the latter to His acknowledgment on the earth (comp. xi. 4, xvii. 10, and therewith § 145, *a*),—an acknowledgment, to be sure, which, if it is to be general, presupposes His death (comp. footnote 5), but is not occasioned by it.

CHAPTER III.

THE APPROPRIATION OF SALVATION.

§ 149. *Faith and Fellowship with Christ.*

Faith, which forms the condition for the appropriation of salvation, because it alone perfects knowledge, is the confident conviction that Jesus is the Son of God (*a*). To reach faith there is needed a testimony of the object of faith, and this testimony must be willingly accepted, and therefore assumes a longing receptiveness (*b*). While the believer by the knowledge of God through Christ receives a life rooted in Christ alone, he becomes conscious of being in Christ, and the important thing now is to continue in Christ (*c*). Then Christ abides in him, and becomes in him ever anew the spring of the blissful knowledge of God and of the new moral life (*d*).

(*a*) The subjective condition on which the obtainment of eternal life (iii. 15, vi. 47, xx. 31), as also deliverance from death depend (viii. 24), is most commonly designated as faith simply. The idea occurs much more frequently in Jesus' mouth than in the synoptical speeches; but as there, it is used almost entirely (comp. Mark xi. 31, xiii. 21) of the confidence with which the word of another is accepted as true.[1] He is believed, as Moses was (v. 46; comp. vi. 30,

[1] Thus God is believed (v. 24) when we accept the testimony as true which He gives (I. v. 10); the Scriptures are believed (ii. 22), or the message (xii. 38, according to Isa. liii. 1), or the spirit of a prophet (I. iv. 1). Comp. § 40, *c*; 139, *b*, footnote 2. It seldom stands for trust in God generally (xi. 40, xiv. 1), as it does so often in the earlier evangelists (§ 29, *c*); and even, xiv. 1, the parallel πιστεύετε εἰς ἐμέ is at once changed in what follows into trust in the infallibility of His word, inasmuch as, according to ver. 2, Jesus would not have said what He had just said had it not been true. Nor, xiv. 29, is it trustful confidence in Christ that is spoken of, as it there refers to faith in Him in the ordinary sense, in whom they might have been mistaken by His going away, had He not told them beforehand. Moreover, πιστεύειν stands, iii. 14, 15, in the sense of trust in reference to the parallel הִבִּיט אֶל, Num. xxi. 9, since the *tert. compar.*, as John gives it, and expressly emphasizes it by the anteposition of ὕψωσεν, lies simply in the salvation-bringing ὑψωθῆναι (against Huther, p. 25 f.). The assertion that the moment of trust in the love of God is the ruling idea in the Johannean faith (Frommann, p. 557), wants any sort of

viii. 31), when His words are believed (v. 47, x. 25; comp. v. 44); He is believed when what He says is regarded as true (iii. 12, iv. 21, v. 38, viii. 45, 46, x. 37, 38, xiv. 11). If this faith refers to the facts which His word announces, then it is the confident persuasion of the truth of those facts (iii. 12, xi. 26; comp. ix. 18, xx. 8). Thus Jesus demands faith in His divine mission (xi. 42, xvii. 8, 21), in His coming from the Father (xvi. 27; comp. ver. 30), in His origin from above (viii. 24; comp. ver. 23), in His oneness with the Father (xiv. 10, 11), in His Messiahship (xiii. 19; comp. vi. 69, xi. 27, xx. 31, I. v. 1, 5); and the apostles confess faith in the love of God (I. iv. 16), which is revealed in His mission (ver. 9). But as the object of faith is here more exactly defined by the contents of Jesus' self-testimony, so the speeches of Christ in our Gospel go beyond those of the Synoptists in this way, that faith is joined directly with Jesus' person.[2] Faith, then, is the persuasion of this, that He is who He will be, and its result, the confession that He is the Christ (ix. 22, xii. 42), or the Son of God (I. iv. 15, ii. 23; comp. I. iv. 2, 3; II. 7). The reason why, with John, the element in the idea of faith, which, with Paul (§ 82, *d*), and in the Epistle to the Hebrews (§ 125, *a*), forms but one side of it, as it has come into exclusive use only in the Apocalypse (§ 135, *b*) and in James (§ 52, *c*), evidently lies in this, that

exegetical basis. In the passage ii. 24, it is said, πιστεύειν ἑαυτόν: to trust oneself to any one.

[2] Πιστεύειν εἰς ἐμέ (vi. 35) occurs nine times, and πιστεύειν εἰς αὐτόν (ii. 11) twelve times. Yet it is quite wrong when Neander, p. 893; Frommann, p. 560; Messner, p. 350, assert that in this way the element of the mystical union with Christ is introduced by the idea of faith. Faith in the Son of God (iii. 16; xviii. 36, vi. 40; comp. I. v. 10) is, according to the connection of ix. 35–38, nothing else than the confident persuasion that Jesus is the Son of God (comp. vi. 29), on which account faith, in the name of the Son of God, is interchanged with it (iii. 18; comp. i. 12, ii. 23, I. v. 13). Since this formula can but say that we firmly believe of Jesus, what the name of the Son of God expresses of Jesus, it is then clear from this, that in the union with εἰς, *c. acc.*, there is indicated no other fundamental meaning of the word, pointing to a personal relation to Christ. In the passage xii. 44, faith in the sender just as faith in the sent is included, as v. 24: πιστεύειν τῷ πέμψαντι (comp. footnote 1). Πιστεύειν τῷ Θεῷ is, according to I. v. 10, a πιστεύειν εἰς τὴν μαρτυρίαν αὐτοῦ, and πιστεύειν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα, I. iii. 23, is exchanged, as synonymous with πιστεύειν τῷ ὀνόματι (comp. viii. 31 with ver. 30). In the formula πιστεύειν εἰς τὸ φῶς (xii. 36), it is at any rate clear that it can but refer to a being persuaded of the quality of Jesus, expressed by τὸ φῶς.

to him the life of the true knowledge of God is the highest good (§ 146). Knowledge, that is to say, is only perfect if there comes confident persuasion of the truth of what is known, so that everything which (§ 147, *b*) seems to be the object of knowledge must, from the above, be also the object of faith. A knowledge won by reflection or in a syllogistic way is, to be sure, ever evident of itself; it carries in itself the evidence for its truth, and therewith its confident certainty. It is not so with intuitive knowledge, of which the apostle speaks, whose object is the revelation of God seen in Christ. This knowledge is immediate, and may therefore rest on a delusion; and this possibility has to be excluded for the consciousness, while confident persuasion comes if the knowledge is to be perfect (xvii. 8; I. iv. 16). Only by faith can it be so perfectly appropriated, that it really becomes an element in our spiritual life, nay, according to § 146, *c*, the special fundamental power, the living principle of it.[3]

(*b*) That we may reach a persuasion of the truth of the fact of salvation, sure, excluding any thought of deception, we need a witness for it (i. 7). Only if other plainly trustworthy witnesses confirm the fact, that they have seen what each individual believes, that he has seen intuitively, can he himself be confidently sure of the truth of this knowledge.[4] In this

[3] Now knowledge is an advancing process, it penetrates step by step, deeper and ever deeper, into the secret of the revelation of God in Christ, although at each stage knowledge (§ 141, *c*). It can but advance, if it is to become at each stage a real knowledge, i.e. a knowledge joined to faith. In this sense each advance of knowledge is again conditioned by faith (vi. 69, x. 38). But along with knowledge, faith too must advance, inasmuch as it appropriates the deeper knowledge, and makes believers confidently certain of their possession. There are then stages in faith as in knowledge, although it is called, likewise, faith at every stage. The disciples already believed (i. 42, 46, 51), yet they reach a higher stage of faith, ii. 11. Peter confesses their faith (vi. 69), and yet Jesus seeks to lead them to faith, xi. 15, xiv. 10, 11 (comp. xiii. 19, xiv. 29). They finally protest that they have attained to faith (xvi. 30), and come only later to full faith (xx. 8; comp. ii. 22, xx. 29). The nobleman believes in one way iv. 47, in another sense iv. 50, and in yet another ver. 53; the people of Jerusalem believe (ii. 23), yet they do not believe in a higher sense (iii. 12). There are disciples who, as such, believe, but, according to Jesus' judgment, do not believe (vi. 60, 64); one is the foundation-laying faith of Christians (I. iii. 23), another is the world-conquering (I. v. 1, 4). Nevertheless, at each stage faith works directly eternal life (ὁ πιστεύων ἔχει ζωὴν αἰώνιον), because at each stage it makes knowledge to be truly living, in which eternal life consists.

[4] Elsewhere, too, μαρτυρία designates such a testimony from one's own expe-

sense has the Baptist, who was sent of God (i. 6, 33, iii. 28), and is hence trustworthy, given witness to the truth (v. 33), or to Jesus (iii. 26), because, through the σημεῖον given him at His baptism (i. 32–34), he was fitted for such μαρτυρία (i. 7, 8, 15; comp. iii. 11). In this sense Jesus witnesses to the truth (xviii. 37), because He testifies only what He has seen with the Father (iii. 11, 32), and His testimony is true (viii. 14), as every one may know from His unselfishness and sinlessness (vii. 18, viii. 45, 46). Finally, the Father Himself witnesses for Him, partly in the Holy Scriptures (v. 37; comp. ver. 39), and partly by the works which He gives Him to do (viii. 18; comp. v. 36, x. 25, vi. 27).[5] Such a testimony *can* work faith, but it works it by no means by any constraining necessity. Generally, those only who are driven by an inner necessity (vii. 37; comp. Matt. v. 6) to come to Jesus, or continuously to follow Him,[6] first hear His word; while the unreceptive are never once in a position to hear Him (viii. 43–47); and this hearing can lead but to faith and

rience (ii. 25, iii. 28, iv. 39, 44, vii. 7, xii. 17, xviii. 23, xix. 35, xxi. 24, iii. 3, 6, 12). Only, in spite of Gess' denial, p. 519, the testimony of the water and the blood, I. v. 7, 8, is spoken of figuratively, inasmuch as the former testifies by the miracle at His baptism, of which the Baptist testifies (i. 32–34), and to the latter by the correspondence between Jesus' death and the prophecies relating to it, as testified by the apostles (xix. 35–37). But fundamentally both these are testimonies by God (I. v. 9), who gave the vision to the Baptist, and by the other occurrences has shown forth Jesus as the promised Messiah. In the early apostolic preaching, too, the testimony of what they had experienced with and in Jesus was the special task of the apostles (§ 42, *a*; 1 Pet. v. 1; 2 Pet. i. 16). But it is only in the Apocalypse that testimony comes to be so full of significance as here, in that Christ is the witness of future things, and revelation is called His testimony (§ 135, *d*). Comp. Rev. ii. 13, xi. 3, xvii. 6; οἱ μάρτυρες Ἰησοῦ (comp. i. 2, xxii. 18).

[5] Jesus is to be believed for the sake of His own word (iv. 41), and we will believe Him, if we are not to render ourselves guilty of an unpardonable sin (xii. 48, xv. 22). But, because His testimony is essentially about His own Being, and the significance of His own person, if any one will apply to Him the maxim, which is true in human things at any rate, that one ought not to bear witness of himself (v. 31, viii. 13), then Jesus can appeal to this witness, whose testimony is unconditionally true (v. 32), and who can witness of Him because He knows Him (x. 15). Later His disciples bear witness of Him, for they have seen His revelation of Himself (xv. 27; I. i. 2, iv. 14; comp. i. 14, xix. 35; I. i. 1, iii. 5, v. 7, 8) and the Paraclete (xv. 26; I. v. 6), who likewise is fitted for this by direct observation (xvi. 13). Finally, every believer has God's testimony in himself, inasmuch as he has experienced that God has given to him the true life by faith in His Son (I. v. 10, 11).

[6] In addition to the fact that those who felt in any way drawn by Jesus came

love (v. 24); but it by no means leads to this necessarily. To many, even among His *μαθηταί*, His word is too hard, too offensive (vi. 60); they cannot receive His word, or they will not keep it as their possession (xii. 47). Only where there is the capacity and the willingness to hear Him or His word (*ἀκούειν τῆς φωνῆς αὐτοῦ*: v. 25, x. 3, 16, 27, xviii. 37; Rev. iii. 20; comp. vi. 60, x. 20; I. iv. 6) is His word or His testimony received (iii. 32; comp. Mark iv. 20), and now come faith and knowledge (xvii. 8, iii. 11, 12). But as the rejection of His word, which essentially testifies of Himself, is a rejection of His person (xii. 48), so the acceptance of the same is an acceptance of His person (v. 43, xiii. 20; comp. § 29, *b*), and that, according to xvi. 27, directly involves love to Him, and this acceptance is the presupposition of faith (i. 12), without which there is no knowledge (vv. 10, 11). The confident persuasion of the truth of intuitive knowledge can be forced on no one, it comes to pass only on the ground of the longing receptivity, by the free act of personal appropriation of what is heard and seen.[7]

(*c*) Because the contents of that knowledge that blesses is the revelation of God in the person of Christ, there arises, by the personal appropriation of it by faith, a relation of person to person; and here begins the peculiar mysticism of the Johannean view of doctrine. As Jesus is conscious within

to Him (i. 48, iii. 2, 26, iv. 30, 40, vi. 5, x. 41), that coming to Him is the expression for that longing susceptibility which is the first predisposition for faith, lying (iii. 20, 21, v. 40) in the free self-determination (vi. 35, 37, 44, 45, 65). When their longing is satisfied, then that coming is perpetuated; it leads to a following of Him (vi. 2, viii. 12, x. 27), the token of abiding discipleship (*μαθηταί*: vi. 66, vii. 3; comp. § 29, *a*).

[7] And therefore this is figuratively set forth as a drinking of the living water (iv. 10, 14, vii. 37), *i.e.* as a reception of the word of Jesus (comp. § 146, *d*), or as an eating of the bread of life (vi. 50, 51, 57, 58), *i.e.* as a reception of His person as the organ of the revelation of God (comp. § 146, *c*), or as an eating of His flesh and a drinking of His blood (vi. 53–56), *i.e.* as an appropriation of His life given up in the sacrificial death as the means of our salvation (comp. § 148, *d*). Just because believing knowledge comes to pass only by such an act of living, personal laying hold of the salvation given in Christ, can it be a living power even for the whole personal life, nay, eternal life itself. It is clear from this that faith, at any rate in the Johannean sense, cannot be without a "turning of the heart" to Christ and to God (the revelation of whom He brings); but in the first place this turning is not trust, and in the second place it is not involved even in the idea of faith, but is the preliminary condition of it (against Huther, p. 28 f.).

Himself that He is in the Father, because His life is rooted in Him (§ 143, *c*), so the believer in Christ, because he is conscious that he has received his true life from Him in the believing susceptibility to receive His testimony of Himself. In contrast to the world, believers are in the Son of God, who, because He is Himself true, has given them the power to know Him that is true, and thus He has become the author of eternal life to us (I. v. 20).[8] With the springing up of this knowledge in believers is this new relation to Christ given them of itself; the believer is in Christ, as the branch is rooted in the vine-stock (xv. 1, 5).[9] But as faith comes into existence only by a free personal act of acceptance (note *b*), being in Christ can abide only in so far as, like Christ's being in God, a conscious and willing act, it realizes

[8] Not merely does the linguistic harshness (§ 145, *b*, footnote 5) of the current interpretation force us to take ἐν τῷ υἱῷ αὐτοῦ as in apposition to ἐν τῷ ἀληθινῷ, but also the course of thought. Then, indeed, the being in God is really the result of the true knowledge of God (I. ii. 3–5), but it was not formerly said that we know God, but only that the Son of God has come and given us the power to do this. But the reason of our opposition to the world lies not in that (v. 19), since Jesus has come to the whole κόσμος, but in this, that we have received Him in faith, and now are in Him, while the world is and continues to be ἐν τῷ πονηρῷ. The point of the passage lies even in this, that Christ has communicated to us that capacity of knowledge (διάνοιαν), not by any one doctrine, but by His person, which as to its nature is identical with the ἀληθινός, as the concluding sentence expressly explains. And even on that account is He the author of life for us, because only by His person does He communicate to us the blessed knowledge of God (comp. § 146, *c*, footnote 5). Comp. xiv. 20, according to which the disciples, when they have come to the full knowledge of the relation of Christ to the Father, know that they are in Him, inasmuch as they have the life given in that knowledge from Him alone (ver. 19).

[9] The truth results from this, as does the mistake from the current idea, according to which faith in the Johannean sense involves mystical living fellowship with Christ (comp. footnote 2). Every believer is in Christ; but faith in Christ and being in Christ are as different as belief in the light (xii. 36) and being in the light (I. ii. 9). With as good right might we assert that the idea of knowledge involves that living fellowship, since, according to xiv. 20, I. v. 20, the latter is given directly with the knowledge which brings life with it. Faith is the subjective condition of being in Christ, but that comes only when the blessed results of faith come, even the eternal life which Christ communicates to the believer. The analogous expression, which expresses the oneness of the Son with the Father, designates also what is involved in the relation of the Son to the Father, only that there that relation is at the same time thought of as something known and desired by Him, because the Son *always* willingly and joyfully acknowledges and holds it fast; with Him, therefore, there can be no distinction between being and abiding in Him (comp. § 143, *c*).

itself ever afresh in steady personal self-surrender to Him from whom the believer has received his new life. Hence Jesus exhorts to abide in Him (xv. 4). Whoever does not abide in Him will not always afresh receive life from Him alone, he has burst the bond which bound him to Christ, the new life expires, and he falls under condemnation (ver. 6).[10] The continuing in Him is not faith, but it presupposes faith, as the being in Him presupposes the having become believing. It is the personal surrender to Him in whom the new relation to Christ, which faith has brought about, is steadily afresh with conscious self-determination perfected, and it can therefore, according to § 141, *d*, be designated also as love to Christ (xiv. 15, 21, 23, 24; comp. xvi. 27, xxi. 15–17). Only when the believer, by such a loving self-surrender, is willing to receive from Christ, and from Him alone, can the life continue, which he receives in the knowledge mediated by Him.

(*d*) If the believer abides in Christ, then Christ promises to abide in him (xv. 4); Christ's being in him is the correlative idea of the believer's being in Christ (xiv. 20), as God is in Christ, because Christ is in Him (§ 143, *c*). Even on that account, abiding in Him is the condition of the continuance of eternal life, because only on this condition abides He in us, and gives us ever afresh the life of the true knowledge of God.[11] We have received Himself as the perfected revelation

[10] But as true discipleship, the result of which is to be in Christ, arises and is maintained only in this way, that we receive and keep the words of Christ (xii. 47), so neither can we abide in Him, if His words (xv. 7), or the gospel preaching, which imparts it yet more fully (I. ii. 24), abide not in us, since the knowledge of the revelation of God in Christ is communicated by means of them, —the knowledge which works everlasting life. In this sense Jesus declares, viii. 31, the abiding in His words, which is but the correlative idea to the abiding of His word in us, to be the sign of a real, *i.e.* a true, stedfast discipleship; only it is clear here yet more directly, that, with the abiding in His words, of which He is Himself the chief object, we abide in Him. And as eternal life, with which the being in Christ is given, can be thought to spring up only by believing appropriation of the life of Christ given in death (vi. 54), then this continuing in Him, according to ver. 56, depends on the ever renewed appropriation. In all this we have only the Johannean expression for true stedfastness in the bonds of discipleship, which Christ demands even in the synoptical Gospels (§ 30, *b*).

[11] The sense of the expression, vi. 57, is, according to the connection with ver. 56, expressly explained in this way: Whoever eats me, and so abides in me, shall live, because I abide in him, and communicate constantly to him my life. If the abiding in Him was always connected with His words abiding in

of God in Him, and just because this highest object of intuitive knowledge is, at the same time, a living person, Christ becomes the spiritual centre of life in us, who determines all life, even the moral, by His effectual power. He only who abides in Christ can bring forth fruit by a new moral living activity (xv. 4), because He, without whom we can do nothing, then abides in us and works this fruit (ver. 5). And so he sins not (I. iii. 6) who abides in Him, the sinless One (ver. 5); and to sin is the sign that one has not seen Him, and by intuitive knowledge has received Him into his innermost life, because He must be the living power in us determining our whole life, excluding all sin (ver. 6). Thus John, while he puts Christ's being in us side by side with our being in Christ, introduces by a general Christian form of expression (§ 62, *c*, footnote 4) his mystical method of view (§ 141, *d*), according to which that surrender to the revelation of God in Christ, coming from the centre of the whole personal life, is looked on as a relation of person to person, and he gives it in that way quite a new significance.[12]

us (xv. 7; comp. footnote 10), then, indeed, He Himself, who reveals Himself in His words, abides in us in them. If we have by these words known Him, and therewith the revelation of God given in Him, then is the truth in us (I. ii. 4); if He has made known to believers the love of God revealed in His mission (xvii. 25, 26), then is He in them (vv. 23, 26).

[12] Even in Paul, Christ's being in us appears side by side with our being in Christ (§ 84, *b*); but while with him the latter is brought about by the former, with John, on the other hand, abiding in Christ is the condition of His being in us. It is, however, connected with this, that there the living fellowship with Christ is thought of as brought about by the communication of His Spirit, and the mystical directness of the Johannean idea is so thoroughly awanting to it. This intervention of the Pauline idea has, without more ado, often enough been imported into the Johannean idea (comp. too, Biedermann, p. 262), but incorrectly. Not the possession of the Spirit, but instruction by the Spirit, in so far as that instruction teaches us ever better to know Christ as what He is, namely, as the complete revelation of God, brings about the abiding (not in Christ, but) in God, according to I. ii. 27. It is connected with this, that, by Paul, we are never exhorted, as here, to abide in Christ, because the being in Christ, brought about by the communication of His Spirit, must ever be realized on all sides, but, according to the nature of the case, can be only conditioned by the conduct of the believer, but not wrought by it. Only in John has it come to be a mystical union with Christ, to a oneness of person with Him. Hence it happens that the Johannean doctrine goes quite beyond the Pauline in this respect, that it advances from a being in Christ to a being in God (§ 150).

§ 150. *Fellowship with God and Sons of God.*

In fellowship with the Son we have, at the same time, a fellowship with the Father, according to which we are and abide in Him (*a*). The continuance of this fellowship is shown in this way, that God abides in us by His Spirit, and enables us really to hold fast to our confession (*b*). From the other side, the working of the revelation of God received in Christ, which determines the whole moral life, is represented as a birth of God, in consequence of which we are in Him (*c*). The result of this is sonship of God, or moral likeness to God (*d*).

(*a*) As Christ is, and will be nothing else than the revelation of God, and therefore is constantly in the Father, and the Father in Him, we may be at the same time in both (xvii. 21: *καθὼς σὺ πατὴρ ἐν ἐμοὶ κἀγὼ ἐν σοὶ ἵνα καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐν ἡμῖν ὦσιν*). What we see in coming to Christ, and the perfect appropriation of the revelation given in Him (§ 149, *b*), is yet, at the same time, the living God Himself, the seeing of whom is eternal life. In whomsoever the gospel proclamation, held fast by faith, abides, a proclamation which convinces us that we have the Father at the same time in the Son (I. ii. 23; comp. II. 9), he abides not only in the Son, but at the same time in the Father (ver. 24), as also, vv. 5, 6, the abiding in the Father is the interchangeable idea of the abiding effective knowledge of God (*ἐγνώκαμεν*: vv. 3, 4); he merges himself in Him with his whole spiritual life, as he sees Him in Christ; he wishes but to live in this seeing of God, and that already involves love to God, as the ever new personal surrender to Christ is love to Him (§ 149, *c*). Thus abiding in God is, to be sure, especially the simple result of this, that we abide in the Son; but as this constantly demands a free surrender afresh to Christ, so can we be exhorted to this, too, on the supposition that the Spirit constantly teaches us to know the full revelation of God in Christ (vv. 27, 28). But since this abiding in God is a continual sinking of oneself in the highest object of knowledge, it brings with it directly, continuously, the enjoyment of eternal life. It is therefore said, I. ii. 25, that to abide in the Son and in the Father is the promise which He has given us,

when He has promised us eternal life.[1] But doubtless this fellowship with the Father[2] is not thought of as a oneness so immediately personal as the mystical living fellowship with Christ, inasmuch as it is constantly brought about by the latter, and by the revelation of God given in it. Therefore the truth of the assertion, that we have fellowship with God can be measured only in this way, whether a man walks in the light of the full revelation of God that has appeared in Christ (I. i. 5), or yet walks in darkness (vv. 6, 7).

(*b*) But fellowship with God has yet another side. If the Father is in the Son, and the Son is in believers, then the consummation of their unity aimed at thereby (xvii. 23) consists in this, that with the Son the Father, too, is in them, wherefore it can be inferred from this, I. iv. 4, that He who works in them is stronger than he who rules in the world (the devil). But the abiding of God in us is throughout the result of our abiding in God (I. iii. 24, iv. 13).[3] It is now said, to be sure, I. iv. 12, that in this abiding of God in us His love is perfected in us, because no higher evidence of it can be given, than if the living God Himself makes His abode in us. But yet, on this side, fellowship with God is not thought of as one so directly personal as that with Christ; for, according to ver. 13, we know that He abides in us by this, that He has given us His Spirit (comp. also

[1] If we would not break all connection, *αὕτη* must be referred to what precedes (comp. Haupt *in loc.*), so that it is defined, in general, by the predicate following. But thus is explained the attraction of apposition to *ἡ ἐπαγγελία*, which appears in the accusative, after this idea has come to be the object in the relative sentence, while it is unbearably harsh if *ἡ ζωὴ ἡ αἰώνιος* were the predicate of the sentence, prepared for by *αὕτη*, and thereby the special main idea to which the words tend.

[2] What, xvii. 21, is designated as a being in Christ and God is called, I. i. 3, fellowship (*κοινωνία*) with the Father and the Son; and as it was the object of the gospel, according to xx. 31, to bring about this eternal life by faith in Christ (as the full revelation of God), so, according to I. i. 3, is it the object of the apostolic preaching to bring about fellowship with those who already have fellowship with the Father and the Son, in order that they may be in them (xvii. 21). According to this, therefore, this fellowship, too, brings the enjoyment of eternal life with it immediately.

[3] This is the case also, iv. 15, where the relation is only apparently inverted, because by keeping fast hold of the confession of Christ, which is but made possible to us by the abiding working of God in us, it is reasoned *à posteriori* first to the cause, and then to the presupposition of that cause, which is given by our abiding in Christ.

I. iii. 24). God abides, therefore, not immediately in us, but by His Spirit; and because this Spirit teaches us ever more to know Christ as the full revelation of God (I. ii. 27; comp. iv. 1–3, where the rule of the Spirit of God is known in the right confession of Christ), this dwelling of God in us, which is brought about by His Spirit, can keep us firm against antichristian false doctrine (I. iv. 4), and can preserve us in the right confession (ver. 15). That abiding of God in us, which corresponds to our abiding in Him, is shown even in this way, that our moral life is moulded according to His will (I. iii. 24).[4] But for the specific form of expression for this working of the revelation of God appropriated by faith, John has coined another form of expression.

(*c*) That our whole moral life may be formed according to the will of God, there is required a divinely-constituted beginning of it, which gives to it its specific character as a life born of God, just as the bodily birth gives character to the bodily life (comp. John iii. 6). Only he who, with his whole spiritual life, merges Himself in God as revealed in Christ, can be ruled by God in the ultimate grounds of his life, or be of God (I. iv. 6).[5] Thus to be of God (I. v. 19) means only that we are determined in the deepest principles of our life by the nature of the true God (ver. 20), a nature which has become known to us on the ground of our being in Christ, in Him that is true. As God is righteous, so every one who is born of God does righteousness; righteousness (I. ii. 29; comp. iii. 10), like love, constitutes the nature of

[4] As the correlative idea of the continual loving sinking oneself in God (note *a*) designates the abiding of God in us, nay, even the living presence of the highest object of knowledge in the centre of our whole spiritual life; and as all true knowledge of God is a knowledge determinative of the entire moral life (§ 146, *c*), inasmuch as the being of God seen in Christ is necessarily normative for us (§ 147), so must the knowledge of the full revelation of God in Christ, opened up to us ever more richly and deeply by the existence of the Spirit in us, become a living power in us in the practical territory.

[5] Wherefore the apostle, I. ii. 28, 29, from a man's abiding in God, directly draws the conclusion that he has been born of God, as the latter is the necessary conclusion from the former; and, I. iv. 7, from the fact that a man has been born of God, he concludes *à posteriori* that he knows God; and that knowledge is steady, lasting, only to him who abides in God. The seeing of God, III. 11, also, which has continued since its first beginning in the past (notice the perf. ἑώρακεν), and the being in God which is the result of this new birth, are interchangeable ideas.

God, and so one knows by love that he has been born of God (I. iv. 7). He only who does good, and so imitates the good he sees in God, is of God (III. 11); for he who is born of God cannot sin (I. iii. 9; comp. v. 18), because no one can be regulated by God and at the same time by what is opposed to God.[6] This being born of God, which accordingly determines the whole conduct of the individual, is a work of God (I. v. 1: ὁ γεννήσας); but as by God's being in us (note *b*), God is not thereby regarded as personally active, but what is specially operative is the revelation of God known in Christ; but that revelation agrees, to be sure, with His nature, and is called the truth (§ 147, *b*). But as right moral life, therefore (I. iii. 19), and the confession of Christ (comp. footnote 6), which forms the contrast to the lies of the false teachers (I. ii. 21, 22), may be referred to one's being of God, so also to one's being of the truth. And therefore even the truth of God, which makes sinning impossible, is regarded as brought about, I. iii. 9, by the powerful abiding of His σπέρμα in us, *i.e.* of the word of God. For the abiding of the word of God in them is indeed that which gives to the little children, I. ii. 14, the power ever anew to overcome the wicked one; and that it does this by the new-born power of God, I. v. 4 shows, according to which it is only what is born of God that overcomes the world. This word, which makes known to us the will of God, and which

[6] Connected with the form of life which is right and acceptable to God, are also the confession of Christ as the perfect revelation of God,—therefore the apostles are of God (I. iv. 4), as they confess Christ, in opposition to anti-christian error, Christ as come in the flesh (ver. 2),—and likewise the continuous listening to the proclamation of that revelation; wherefore those only who from knowing God are of Him, listen to it, and by God's abiding in them (comp. note *b*) are put into a position to overcome false doctrine (ver. 4). If it is only said in this passage, that they have overcome false teachers in consequence of their being of God, and if, further, the reason of this is that God is in them,—which, according to note *b*, is brought about by His Spirit,—then it is clear that the latter is but the right enlightenment which exposes all lies, but the former is that determination by God which alone makes one capable and willing to appropriate the revelation received, and to produce its fruits in life. For all that is born of God overcomes the world (I. v. 4), out of which the temptations to what is contrary to God come to us, whether these be lusts leading to sin or an inclination to false doctrine; and so the faith which overcomes the world (ver. 5), or has already, according to ver. 4, overcome it, cannot be the beginning of faith, which is the condition of all saving experience, but only faith as proved in the conflict with temptation, a faith which springs from being born of God (ver. 1).

hence, by the truth contained in it, is to preserve us (I. i. 8, 10) from that self-deceit which leads us to deny our own sins, has, like the truth itself (§ 147, *b*), which also abides in us (II. 2), a delivering, a morally-determining power (comp. § 146, *d*), by which God comes to be Himself powerful in us.[7]

(*d*) Those who are born of God are called children of God (*τέκνα τοῦ Θεοῦ*: I. ii. 12, 13),—perhaps intentionally,—never sons of God, so as not to approach in appearance the peerless position of the only-begotten Son of God, just as the idea of being born of God is never applied to the latter (§ 145, *a*, footnote 2). There is in this way nothing to prevent the perfect sonship of Christ likewise presupposing a perfect moral likeness to God, as the sonship of believers does a relative likeness. Christ is evidently called, I. iii. 8, the Son of God on account of His sinlessness (ver. 5), or positively on account of His divine righteousness (ver. 7; comp. ii. 29). And the name Son of God also seems, I. i. 7, to point to His sinlessness. But what is true of Him according to His original nature, is wrought in them by their being born of God, the result of which, as it determines the whole moral life by the revealed nature of God, can be only likeness to God in moral nature. Sonship to God is known by not sinning, by righteousness (I. iii. 9, 10).[8] To be sure, this ideal is not even once realized.

[7] The word of God, therefore, is regarded, as by Peter (§ 46) and James (§ 52), as the seed from which the new (moral) life is produced. With this, however, we are not to confound the current combination (comp. Frommann, p. 191; Köstlin, p. 223; Messner, p. 351),—which, however, does not occur at all in John,—by which the birth from God is the beginning of the eternal life in the specifically Johannean sense. According to what has been said, footnote 5 in reference to I. iv. 7, III. 11, the birth from God is realized only in the result of the knowledge of God, in which the believer has eternal life directly (§ 146, *c*); it has to do, therefore, simply with the new determination of life, in which the salvation received in the knowledge of God (the *ζωὴ αἰώνιος*) works and shows itself outwardly. The Spirit, on the other hand, is not by John looked on as He who brings about this working of God; rather the Spirit of Truth is known in this way, that His testimony is heard by those who are of God (I. iv. 6). As the whole idea of a being born of God is specifically Johannean, so the idea, occurring in the speeches of Christ, of a being born of water and of the Spirit (iii. 5) is nowhere further realized by the apostle. What is peculiar to him is distinguished, moreover, from the Petrine idea of the second birth (§ 46), and from that of the Pauline new creation (§ 84), by this, that it never goes back on the past that had to be changed. Even the *ἄνωθεν γεννηθῆναι* (iii. 3, 7), with its "from before," points back only to the beginning of life laid in the first birth.

[8] It is clear from this that sonship with John does not designate, as with Paul

To those who accept Him by faith, Christ has given not sonship itself, but the power (comp. xix. 10, 11) to *become* the sons of God (i. 12); the last and highest realization of this ideal, a realization for the present fathomless, lies only in the future consummation (I. iii. 2). But as certainly as salvation in Christianity is never a merely future thing, but always an already-present thing, this ideal is realized by the truth from God, in the abiding ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ εἶναι. As those in whose world-conquering faith[9] the being born of God is verified, Christians know themselves as children of God (I. v. 1, 2); as those born of God, who even now do righteousness (I. ii. 29), are they even now children of God (I. iii. 2), who can quite well be distinguished from the children of the devil (ver. 10). But they know also that they have not become so of themselves, but that God, as their Father, has made them to share His highest love in His highest revelation to them (in Christ), in order thereby to make them children of God (I. iii. 1; comp. iv. 12). And thus even here in the idea of sonship to God there is not lacking the consciousness of fatherly love (comp. § 147, *c*), but it is realized only in moral likeness of nature with the Father.

§ 151. *Keeping the Commandments of God.*

That which is necessary for the attainment of salvation is

(§ 83), the Christian's new standing in grace; it is not an objective relation to God (comp. Frommann, p. 626, who confounds sonship to God with eternal life; comp. on the other hand, footnote 7), but a subjective quality, in which the world as little knows the children of God as they do God Himself (I. iii. 1). This is the sense in which Jesus, even in the oldest tradition, presents sonship to His disciples, as the ideal (§ 21, *c*) which must be no doubt reached, since God has revealed Himself to them as their Father. Elsewhere, too, in Christ's speeches in our Gospel, the idea of sonship is taken in this metaphorical sense of moral likeness of nature. The right to call themselves children of Abraham is decided by the fact that one does the works of Abraham (viii. 39, 40); and those who do the works of the devil (viii. 38, 41) are called his children (viii. 44).

[9] It is but an apparent contradiction if faith is, i. 12, but the condition by which only the power is received to become the child of God, and, I. v. 1, at the same time the sign of the birth from God accomplished, or of the sonship given therewith. For in the former case faith in His name is but the first stage of faith, which is sufficient in consequence of the receptive acceptance of Christ (§ 149, *a*, footnote 3); in the other case, faith in His Messiahship is the proof of that faith, which has overcome the temptation to false doctrine (I. v. 4, 5). Comp. footnote 6.

also set forth as a fulfilling of God's commandments from love to Him, and these require faith and brotherly love in particular (*a*). But this fulfilling of them, and the loving mind from which it proceeds, are begotten ever afresh by the revelation of God given in Christ (*b*). The fulfilling of the commands of God in the actual reality of Christian life continues, no doubt, imperfect, and in that way it may result in the deadly sin of falling away (*c*). And so to secure its normal development it requires an impulse, and that lies in the prospect of retribution (*d*).

(*a*) If the knowledge of the revelation of God given in Christ, and gotten by faith, produces, by its power to regulate the life, the being born of God, which tends to moral similarity of nature to Him, so, just as in the speeches of Christ in the synoptical Gospels (§ 21, *c*), the progress of the Christian life seems to be accomplished by an inherent necessity, and the need of a law to regulate it seems to be taken away. Yet Reuss, ii. p. 485 [E. T. ii. 435], mistakes an essential side of the Johannean view of doctrine when he denies that here too, and very frequently, everything needful for the realization of salvation is put, quite as in the Old Testament way, under the point of view of the fulfilment of a divine command. Quite as in the synoptic tradition (§ 21, *b*), Jesus requires the keeping, *i.e.* the doing of His words (viii. 51; comp. I. ii. 5: *τηρεῖν τὸν λόγον*), which is identical with the words of God (xiv. 23, 24, xvii. 6), or the keeping His commandments (*τηρεῖν τὰς ἐντολάς*: xiv. 15, 21), which is at the same time a keeping of the commandments of God (xv. 10; comp. I. ii. 3, iv. 3, xxii. 24, v. 2, 3; II. 6), quite as in the Apocalypse (§ 135, *a*; comp. § 136, *c*).[1] The fulfilling of the will of God, as it is expressed in these commandments, is accordingly the one condition of salvation (I. ii. 17; comp. xiii. 17); and this fulfilling, as in the Old Testament, is the doing of righteousness (I. ii. 29, iii. 7, 10;

[1] In this sense evangelical preaching (I. i. 5: *ἀγγελία*) even contains a command (I. iii. 11); it is even said, I. ii. 7, of the commandment drawn from the sum of evangelical preaching (i. 5), that it is the word which they have heard from the beginning, inasmuch as it is ever necessarily given with it. Moreover, all sin remains for the Christian to be a freeing oneself from the commandments of God (I. iii. 4: *ἡ ἁμαρτία ἐστὶν ἡ ἀνομία*), and every deviation from this rule (*ἀδικία*: I. i. 9 comp. vii. 18) sin (I. v. 17: *πᾶσα ἀδικία ἁμαρτία ἐστίν*).

comp. § 24, *a*). But John comprehends the contents of this divine will, I. iii. 23, in the command to believe on Christ, and to love one another.[2] It is self-evident that God must require faith as the condition of all appropriation of salvation (§ 149, *a*); and although love is the necessary effect of the perfect revelation of God (§ 147, *c*), yet Jesus so announces it as the new commandment (xiii. 34, xv. 12, 17; comp. I. iv. 21), the fulfilment of which is the sign of His discipleship (xiii. 35), and it is therefore characterized quite, as § 25, *b*, as the chiefest commandment. But even if the thought, that all fulfilling of the divine commandments must proceed from love (comp. § 25, *b*), is not foreign to the Old Testament, yet is this here brought into the greatest prominence,[3] and every demand on the Christian is summed up in a loving mind towards God, as in the synoptical speeches of Christ, to seek after the kingdom of God or after righteousness, is but the expression for love to God (comp. § 26, *d*, footnote 3).

(*b*) This comprehension of all the commandments in the unity of love to God, is now the means with John to adjust the more legal view of the condition of salvation with that view of the development of salvation which is peculiar to

[2] Moreover, from the connection of I. v. 4 with ver. 3, it is clear that faith is included in the commandments of God (comp. § 150, *c*, footnote 6). As it never comes except by the free action of the individual (§ 149, *b*), it is the work required of God (vi. 29), a keeping of His word (xvii. 6; comp. vv. 7, 8); the refusal of that faith appears as culpable disobedience (iii. 36; comp. § 44, *c*; 82, *d*), nay, as specially sin (xvi. 9, ix. 41; comp. § 125, *d*). On the other hand, brotherly love is the commandment given (I. iv. 21) by God (II. 4) through Christ (I. iii. 22). And hence brotherly love (I. ii. 9, 10) is the clearest mark of belonging to the kingdom of light (*i.e.* to the fellowship of the disciples), iii. 10, the chief part of δικαιοσύνη, ver. 11, the commandment given from the beginning along with evangelical preaching (comp. ii. 4–6), iii. 14, 15, the mark of the true life and of being of the truth (vv. 18, 19).

[3] As the fulfilling the divine commandments in the case of Christ sprang from love to His Father (xiv. 31), so here, too, doing the divine will (I. ii. 17) is but the result of that love to the Father which excludes all love to the world (ver. 15; comp. Jas. iv. 4). As fulfilling the commandments of Jesus is the result of love to Him (xiv. 21), so the fulfilling of the divine commandments is the result of love to God (I. v. 2), a love which consists in a walk according to His commandments (II. 6), and makes the keeping of them easy (I. v. 3); in keeping His word is love to Him perfected (I. ii. 5); for here, too, to think of God's love perfecting itself toward us (Ritschl, ii. p. 374) contradicts the whole context, which speaks simply of the confirmation of the knowledge of God in believers (comp. note *b*).

him; and in this way, too, his mysticism preserves its practical character throughout, and is preserved from quietistic and even antinomian vagaries. As, according to § 149, *c*, that mystical abiding in Christ is at bottom one with love to Him, from which, according to footnote 3, keeping His commandments results of itself; so, according to § 150, *a*, to abide in God is such a loving losing oneself in Him, from which the keeping His commandments must come necessarily.[4] It is hence said, I. ii. 5, that we, by becoming perfected in that love of God which is shown in keeping His commandments, know that we are in Him, and that the abiding in Him must be verified by imitation of the walk of Christ as our example (ver. 6). That this love to God, that is to say, is perfected in us, is the direct effect of the revelation of God in Christ which is apprehended by faith, and of the fellowship with God produced thereby, inasmuch as we know His love in the former, and in the latter experience it in a way which must necessarily produce love in us.[5] We love, only because

[4] Whilst, therefore, according to the mystical view, Christ's abiding in us must correspond to our abiding in Him, and this abiding of Christ in us by His gracious work makes us capable for all moral activity of life (xiv. 4, 5; comp. § 149, *d*), so this activity is here the (psychological) effect of love to Him, and likewise the fulfilling of the divine commandments is the necessary (psychological) result of love to God (xiv. 21); as, on the other hand, the abiding in God, identical with the latter, on account of the appropriation of the full knowledge of God given with it in Christ, an appropriation ever fresh and living, of itself creates the new moral life, according to § 146, *c*; 147.

[5] In order to show the necessary connection of faith and love, John proceeds, in the second principal section of his Epistle, from the fact acknowledged in I. ii. 5, that it can be said only of him who keeps the commandments that he abides in God, but he now adds the new element that God abides in him (comp. § 150, *b*), as is known from the Spirit which He has given us (I. iii. 24). After he has now established how this Spirit may be known from this, that He confesses the incarnation of Christ (iv. 1-3), he can show, that he who has been taught by this Spirit knows God as He is manifested in the sending of His Son, knows Him according to His nature as *love*, and as he is regulated by this nature (born of God) in the deepest elements of his nature he must himself love (vv. 7–10). But not merely in the sending of the Son is God's nature made known to us; we know Him whom no one hath seen according to His nature of love perfectly in this way, that He perfects His love in us, while He, abiding in us, works godlike love in us (ver. 12; comp. with this Ritschl, ii. p. 372), and that love makes us (§ 150, *d*) to be children of God (comp. iii. 1: ποταπὴν ἀγάπην δέδωκεν ἡμῖν ὁ Θεός). For that it is He who abides in us if we abide in Him, we know from the Spirit He has given us, whose testimony of Christ agrees with that of the apostles (vv. 13, 14), so that the confession of Him is wrought by

He has first loved us (I. iv. 19), naturally, in the first place, His own self, who anticipated us with His love (ver. 10), but along with Him who begot our new life of love, him also who is begotten of Him (I. v. 1).[6] Accordingly, just because the new life of love, which is begotten in us by the complete revelation of God, is in its deepest roots love to God, that perfect revelation of God creates ever afresh in us that mind of love which is the condition of every step forward in the life of salvation,[7] as also in the moral life. God therefore here, too, only requires from us (as § 21, *c*) what He has Himself created in us by His highest revelation. And therefore it is said, I. v. 3, that the commandments of God, in the doing of which love to God is occupied, are not hard, because he who is born of God (ver. 4), *i.e.* who is determined in His innermost being by the revelation of God's love, feels himself driven of himself to love Him in a way which makes love to the brethren, and therewith the fulfilling of His highest commandments, to be a loved and an easy duty.

God Himself by His Spirit in us (ver. 15; comp. § 150, *b*). But as we have known God's love to be His peculiar nature, so we know, that to abide in love (which, indeed, is identical with love abiding in us) is nothing else than to abide in God and God in us, that the former is not in any way a result brought about by the latter, but is itself given along with the latter (ver. 16), because by it the love which forms God's nature is perfectly realized among us (ver. 17).

[6] It is said expressly, ver. 2, that we know by this, *i.e.* that it follows from the general statement in ver. 1, that we love the children of God whenever, *i.e.* as soon as we love God, and we show this love by doing His commandment. The current explanation of this sentence, by which he would say, that the love of God is likewise the sign of brotherly love, as the latter is the sign of the former, must, if it is to have any sense, introduce the thought that we know brotherly love as right if it is exercised in the way prescribed by the commandments of God, and it overlooks the fact that it is not ἐάν which is used, as is always the case in similar turns (comp. ii. 3), but ὅταν.

[7] It is true that the beginning of the life of salvation by faith in Christ cannot come without a longing for the divine (§ 149, *b*), in which the germ of love to God ever lies; but this germ is made ever more richly fruitful, and is unfolded in the development of the life of salvation by the revelation of God in Christ, just as it cannot reach any such development without surrendering itself lovingly ever anew to this revelation of God; but this latter is ever given of itself by the love to God which is begotten in us. It is characteristic, that for the apostle of love (§ 141, *d*) everything on which the normal development of the Christian life depends is in the end comprehended in love to God and Christ, as with Paul it is in faith (§ 86, *d*); and yet this confident self-surrender to the grace which procures all our salvation is something essentially distinct from that loving merging oneself in the revelation of God in Christ, which brings all salvation with it.

(*c*) If one looks at the Christian life from the ideal point of view, according to which it depends on the revelation of God in Christ producing a new life, it is perfected at a stroke. As the believer has eternal life directly, so the birth from God also comes with the believer's being in God, that birth which makes all sin impossible. He who is born of God, and abides in Christ, sins not (I. v. 18, iii. 6), nay, he cannot sin (I. iii. 9; comp. § 150, *c*). He who yet sins, has not as yet received into himself that revelation of God by the knowledge of Christ (I. iii. 6, iv. 8; III. 11; comp. § 146, *c*), he is not yet in the condition of one enlightened (I. ii. 9–11; comp. § 147, *a*). But whenever the Christian life is regarded rather from the legal point of view, according to which a constant fulfilling of the divine requirements is necessary for its normal development (note *a*), then the possibility exists continually, that it is not sufficient for development, and this possibility is ever again realized (comp. § 30, *b*).[8] Even the fruit-bearing branch requires further cleansing (xv. 2; comp. xiii. 10); the believer is ever yet sinning (I. i. 8, 10, ii. 1), and he hence needs ever cleansing and forgiveness (I. i. 7, 9; comp. xx. 23); intercession with the Father (I. ii. 1, 2), and brotherly intercession (I. v. 16); he needs to be ever cleansing himself afresh from all stains of sin (I. iii. 3: ἁγνίζειν; comp. 1 Pet. i. 22; Jas. iv. 8). According to this rather legal view, which cannot be dispensed with for the consideration of the actual reality of the Christian life, just as in the Old Testament (comp. § 42, *b*; 44, *c*; 115, *b*) a distinction is drawn between sins of infirmity, which do not destroy abiding in Christ (xv. 2), in which God, who is greater than our hearts, knows our deepest being in truth, although our heart, on the other hand, is ever conscious of fresh shortcomings (I. iii. 19, 20),[9] and deadly sins (I. v. 17; comp. Num.

[8] The believer needs ever again to be exhorted to continue in Christ and in God (xv. 4; I. ii. 28), not to sin (I. ii. 1), but to continue in love (I. iii. 18, iv. 7; comp. xv. 17); he needs ever to be reminded of his Christian duty (I. ii. 6, 3, 16, iv. 11: ἀφιλαι; comp. xiii. 14); he has to be warned against the love of the world (I. ii. 15), and against being misled (I. iii. 7; comp. ii. 26). Although he that is born of God keeps himself conformably to his nature from all sin (I. v. 18), yet Jesus has to ask the Father to keep the disciples (xvii. 11, 15).

[9] This so often misinterpreted passage does not speak of a silencing our

viii. 22: חֵטְא לְמוּת); for the doers of such even the otherwise general commandment to intercede is no more required (ver. 16), because God cannot hear such prayers (ver. 14), because by not abiding in Christ one falls irrecoverably into condemnation (xv. 6, and therewith § 149, *c*).[10]

(*d*) If from an ideal point of view the Christian life is developed by an inherent necessity, then, to secure its normal development, it needs no special motive; and if the believer has eternal life immediately, then the point of view of retribution, which for present service determines only a future reward, seems to be quite shut out. But whenever the process of Christian life is regarded as a continuous doing of the divine commands (note *a*), what is necessary for the attainment of salvation appears as a service, for the achieving of which there is need of a powerful impulse, in view of the danger of the sin of falling away which threatens it, according to note *c*; and from this point of view, everything which was given in the progress of the process of salvation was given necessarily in the begin-

hearts, because πείθειν can never designate that, not even in contrast to καταγινώσκειν (comp. Huth. *in loc.*). Since, indeed, one angry may be persuaded to allow his indignation to go, and so to silence it (comp. Matt. xxviii. 14); but even the persuading the heart (which is certainly not meant), that it cease from its self-condemnation, cannot certainly be called a silencing of it. It can therefore only be said, that, if we know from our true hearts (ver. 18) that we are of the truth, if we keep up, as it were, our dialogue in the presence of God, and deal with Him therefore in the matter, how we will stand in His judgment, we will persuade our heart, that if our heart condemn us, God is yet greater than it is. Naturally, this cannot proceed from His forgiving love, as it is explained by a reference to His omniscience, nor from the strictness of His judgment, about which we dare not persuade our own hearts, when condemning us, but only from this, that He knows our innermost depths ἐκ τῆς ἀληθείας εἶναι, even though it is not so verified outwardly, as it ought to be verified.

[10] The sin unto death is not here, therefore, as in the synoptical speeches of Jesus (§ 22, *b*), and in Peter (§ 42, *b*; 44, *c*), final hardening against Christ, but, as in the Epistle to the Hebrews (§ 125, *d*), that falling away from Him by which the being in Christ is simply broken off. If one, who has already had eternal life by faith, ceases to be in Christ, and thus has not eternal life abiding in Him (I. iii. 15), then that is specially a *contradictio in adjecto*. The apostle explains this fact, which stands in irreconcilable contradiction with the ideal view of the Christian life, in this way, that members who fall away from the Church had never been her true members (I. ii. 19). They have therefore never in full reality appropriated the revelation of God in Christ, and no conclusion can therefore be drawn from their falling away against its specific effectual power (comp. § 30, *c*).

ning of it, and may be put in the point of view of a reward, which is to be the motive for securing the human service necessary for the appropriation of salvation.[11] If in many such statements (footnote 11) only the earthly consummation of what is sought in service is the promised reward, yet may its future consummation as such also be kept in view, as § 32, *c*, since John, according to § 148, *c*, distinguishes from the eternal life already present its future consummation. In this sense, to look at the reward coming at Christ's Parousia becomes a motive to abide in God, inasmuch as only this latter can give us confidence in reference to the final decision then to be made (I. ii. 28). Even on this account must love be perfected in us (in abiding in love, which is identical with abiding in God), that we may have confidence at the day of judgment, because we then, though still in the world, yet like Christ Himself already stand in complete fellowship with the Father; and love then becoming perfect drives out all fear, since fear carries in itself its own punishment, as it is but the expression for the relationship of love to God, that has been disturbed (and therefore not yet come to perfection), a relationship which must be the deepest ground of our new life of love (I. iv. 17, 18).[12] But as abiding in Christ or love to

[11] One is reminded quite of the way in which Jesus, according to § 32, *b*, emphasizes the equivalence of reward and service, when He here promises to abide in us, as the reward of our abiding in Him (xv. 4), although it is but according to its nature that the revelation of God received by faith should become effectual in us. He likewise promises His love to us as the reward of our love to Him when proved by obedience (xiv. 21; comp. xv. 10, 14),—that love to us which brings about the highest gift of the Spirit (xiv. 15, 16), or the love of the Father (xiv. 21, 23), which, from the connection with xvi. 27, assures us of the hearing of prayer (ver. 26; comp. ver. 23); and this hearing of prayer with the apostle is a result of obedience in fulfilling His commands springing from love (I. iii. 22; comp. ix. 31). Thus even Jesus Himself, according to § 144, *d*, footnote 9, looked at the receiving of that which belonged to His nature and calling as the reward of His conduct on earth.

[12] From the connection of I. iv. 17 with ver. 16, as explained footnote 5, it is clear that ἐν τούτῳ can but point backwards (comp. Haupt *in loc.*), and that μεθ' ἡμῶν (comp. II. 2) is connected with τετελείωται. The same thing follows from this, that the clause with ἵνα gives no sense, if it is to explain the ἐν τούτῳ, as then even Ritschl, ii. p. 374 f., understands it rightly as a purpose clause. But it is not possible by ἡ ἀγάπη to think with him of the love of God, because the οὐ τετελείωται ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ in its correlation with τετελείωται ἡ ἀγάπη cannot possibly be understood of the perfecting of our confidence by the divine love. Moreover, Haupt has, on the other hand, pointed to the parallelism

God proves itself by keeping His commandments, Jesus could set before the individual, v. 29, at the resurrection a destiny corresponding to his works; and, xii. 25, 26, to His servant, not shrinking from self-sacrifice for his humble service, quite in the way of the Synoptists (Matt. x. 39; Luke xiv. 11, and therewith § 32, *b*), he could set an equivalent reward in his being honoured by the Father. In view of the glorious prospect which Christian hope opens up (I. iii. 2), the apostle in this sense exhorts to strive after purity from sin (ver. 3), as every stain of sin excludes from this blessed goal; and he warns them against being seduced to fall away, by pointing to the loss of the full reward threatened in the future life (II. 8: *ἵνα . . . μισθὸν πλήρη ἀπολάβητε*).

CHAPTER IV.

THE HISTORICAL REALIZATION OF SALVATION.

§ 152. *The Preparatory Revelation of God.*

Israel possessed a revelation of God in prophecy, the last bearer of which was the Baptist, whose task it was to bear testimony for Christ (*a*). This testimony had an abiding significance, inasmuch as it was to lead to faith in the Son of God (*b*). The law, too, although it was already abrogated for the apostle for the present, is a revelation of God. It makes one receptive of the revelation of God in Christ, and thus serves as a positive preparation for the latter (*c*). But the majority of the very people of the Logos has not received

with the passage I. ii. 28, where also confidence at the day of judgment is made dependent on abiding in God, and it hence then follows necessarily that the *tert. comp.* with Christ's abiding, which, as iii. 3, 7, can only be placed in the character of this abiding, is to be sought in His continuous abiding in God, and this, it is self-evident, excludes any fear before the judgment. But the same thing is shown ver. 18, but from the other side, according to which, by the abiding in love, which is identical with abiding in God, the nature of divine love is perfectly realized in us. For a *τελεία ἀγάπη*, as it drives out all fear, is just the *ἀγάπη τετελειωμένη* in ver. 17; and if it is here spoken of love generally, then we also saw, note *b*, how indissoluble the love to God is from love to the brethren, so that the application can quite easily be made to the latter.

the salvation, although that salvation found receptive souls in the heathen world (*d*).

(*a*) Even Judaism possessed a knowledge of God, in comparison with which that of the Samaritans is designated as a not knowing of God (iv. 22);[1] there must therefore have been given even in Old Testament times a revelation of God, a thing which Köstlin, p. 88, wrongly denies. Doubtless, it is even said in the Old Testament itself (Ex. xxx. 20) that there was then no direct vision of God, such as the Son had with the Father (vi. 46), and as Christians can have by Him; yet the word of God came to individuals (x. 35; comp. ix. 29), or they saw a form of God (v. 37) in vision or in a theophany.[2] But the prophets could testify of Him from personal experience too; for they had indeed beheld even the glory of the Logos (xii. 41; comp. § 145, *a*), and heard Him speak, as is plain from this, that, according to the Messianic interpretation of the apostle, they often introduce Him speaking (ii. 17, xii. 38, xiii. 18, xv. 25; comp. § 74, *c*; 116, *c*). On that account it is self-evident that the passage x. 8 can refer only to the contemporary leaders of the people, and not to the prophets of the Old Testament (comp. also, Scholten,

[1] The knowledge of God possessed by the Jews is, to be sure, only a relative knowledge, and it ceases to be a knowledge of God as soon as God is perfectly revealed in Christ (vii. 28, viii. 19, 55, xv. 21, xvi. 3; comp. § 147, *c*, footnote 7); but so long as it corresponds to the stage of the revelation of God given, it is a real knowledge, and every stage of it is designated as knowledge simply (§ 149, *a*, footnote 3). Even the Samaritans had a knowledge of God; but because, by their rejection of prophecy, they had excluded themselves from the higher stages of the revelation of God in Israel, Jesus calls it an οὐκ εἰδέναι. Even the revelation of God in Christianity is yet, according to I. iii. 2, not the highest, but as that which corresponds to the revelation of God in Christ, it is spoken of throughout simply as knowledge.

[2] If Jesus denied to the nation in His time both forms of prophetic revelation (v. 37), because prophecy had been silent for centuries, yet He will in that way confirm the truth that His contemporaries yet possessed the word of God, though only in the written records of those earlier revelations (ver. 38). Nevertheless, it was a mistake if they thought that by the possession of these writings they already had (ver. 39) eternal life, *i.e.* the real saving blessing, as it was given only by the perfected revelation of God (§ 146), and if on that account they would not come to Christ, in order to receive it from Him alone (ver. 40). For these writings had their essential significance only in this, that they (*i.e.* God in them) but testified of Christ (ver. 39; comp. vv. 37, 46) or of His fate (xx. 9), and this was here done in many ways by the typical histories embodied in them (iii. 14, vi. 32; perhaps also i. 52). Comp. § 73, *c*.

p. 149; Immer, p. 539). As the last of these prophets, for the apostle the Baptist comes into notice (§ 149, *b*), and exclusively as regards his *μαρτυρία* (i. 19); since he, too, had heard a voice of God (ver. 33), and had seen a form (vv. 32, 34), in consequence of which he could testify of the Son of God. But his significance must cease when the Light Himself had come into the world (vv. 7, 8; comp. iii. 29, 30).[3] For in spite of this, its testimony of the Logos prophecy is yet by no means a Christianity in the midst of Judaism (comp. Kostlin, p. 53), it rather ever testifies of the Bearer of the perfect revelation of God who is coming; this revelation it cannot give itself. Of earthly origin and of earthly nature the prophet, too, can but speak what is earthly, what refers to the earthly appearance of Messiah (iii. 31); and if Jesus comprehends His own testimony, so far as it had to do with what was earthly, with that of the Baptist (ver. 11), yet He only who has come from heaven can declare heavenly things (vv. 12, 13; comp. vv. 32, 33). But He can do this only after He has appeared in the flesh (comp. § 145); the perfect revelation of God and Messianic times come only with the incarnation of the Logos. Abraham had rejoiced in joyful hope at the day of Messiah, but only when the Messiah appeared on the earth had he seen Him (out of Hades), and his hope had received its fulfilment (viii. 56).

(*b*) The testimony of prophecy has its significance by no means exclusively for Judaism (comp. Köstlin, p. 133). It is not merely to unbelieving Jews that Jesus points to the fact that the Scriptures testify of Him (note *a*); He shows even to the disciples how the Scriptures are fulfilled in His fate (xiii. 18, xv. 25, xvii. 12), and He does it with the express design, that they may be led thereby to believe that it is He of whom the Scriptures prophesy (xiii. 19). But the

[3] He was a lamp, who might have led His contemporaries to the knowledge of the truth (v. 35), and Jesus holds his testimony to be valid, as it could work faith, and therewith salvation in them (ver. 34). But He needs no more any testimony of man's, since He had received from the Father the testimony of His works (ver. 36). To be sure, He distinguishes from the human testimony of the Baptist the testimony of God in the Scriptures (vv. 37–39), a testimony which was yet given only by the prophets; but only because the divine origin of these was generally acknowledged, while the divine mission of the Baptist was not.

Gospel shows, above all, how weighty this testimony of the Scriptures is for the apostle, and also for believing readers.[4] If, alongside the witness for Christ, he does not quite so strongly emphasize the promises of prophecy, that does not prove that it is done by him strictly only as an accommodation for Judaism (Köstlin, p. 134; comp. Reuss, ii. p. 477 [E. T. ii. 427]); but it is connected with this, that the Messianic salvation is for him essentially a revelation of God given in the person of Christ, for the believing reception of which there is required, according to § 149, *b*, no testimony as regards His person. Yet even Jesus Himself sees, vi. 45, vii. 38, the blessings of the Messianic times prophesied in the prophets, and it is pointed out by the Gospel, with a design like that of but one of the Synoptists, that He is the bringer of the saving consummation promised in the Old Testament and looked for by the people. Even in the coming of the Baptist the popular questions about the Messiah are at once raised (i. 20, 25, iii. 28). Even the first disciples confess, on the ground of the testimony which the Baptist gives of His being the Son of God (in the Messianic sense) (i. 34), that they have found in Jesus the Messiah (ver. 42), of whom Moses and the prophets wrote (ver. 46), the Son of God, appointed to be the King of Israel (ver. 50). Jesus Himself makes the Samaritan woman know Him as the looked-for Messiah (iv. 25, 26; comp. vv. 29, 42), and the people wish, since they have recognised in Him the prophet promised Deut. xviii. 15, to proclaim Him king (vi. 14, 15). Here, too, the faith of

[4] He sets forth emphatically how the disciple, in the holy zeal with which Jesus purified the temple (ii. 17), and in the entrance into Jerusalem (xii. 14–16), had seen a fulfilling of Scripture; he points out in the story of the crucifixion a series of fulfilments of Old Testament words of Scripture (xix. 24, 28, 36, 37; comp. I. v. 7, 8, and therewith § 149, *b*, footnote 4), and he finds in Isaiah the key to explain the unbelief which Jesus found among His people (xii. 38–40). The quotations are by John almost always introduced as simply words of Scripture (εἶπεν ἡ γραφή: vii. 38, xix. 37; comp. xiii. 18, xix. 24, 28, 36: ἵνα ἡ γραφὴ πληρωθῇ; γεγραμμένον ἐστίν: ii. 17, vi. 31, xii. 15, sometimes with the addition ἐν τῷ νόμῳ, or ἐν τοῖς προφήταις: x. 34, xv. 25, vi. 45). Only in i. 23, xii. 38, 39, is Isaiah introduced as speaking (comp. § 74, *a*; 136, *b*, footnote 5). With the exception of two quotations from Zechariah, they are taken from the Psalms and Isaiah; and he follows, except in those two cases (xii. 15, xix. 37; comp. Rev. i. 7), the text of the Septuagint, and in part they are dealt with very freely (xii. 15, 40, xiii. 18, xv. 25, and especially the scarcely recognisable vii. 38; comp. § 74, *b*).

the disciples is tested at a crisis by Peter's confession, that He is simply the consecrated One of God, *i.e.* the Messiah (vi. 69). In the lively popular scene in the seventh chapter, the question discussed both by the doubters (vv. 26, 27, 41, 42; comp. xii. 34) as also by the believers (vv. 31, 41; comp. ver. 48), is, whether the signs of the Messiah agree with Him. The whole of chap. ix. turns on this, how the members of the Sanhedrim, since they have decreed excommunication for any one confessing His Messiahship (ver. 22), try to turn the man born blind, who had been healed by Him, away from believing in Him, and how Jesus leads Him to believe in His Messiahship (ver. 38). Once more the Jews ask of Him a frank confession of His Messiahship (x. 24), and, although He gives them more than they had asked, He yet evidently proclaims Himself to be the Son consecrated and sent by God, *i.e.* to be the Messiah (ver. 36). Even Martha replies to Him; on the occasion of His deepest revelations, by the simple confession of His Messiahship (xi. 27). On the occasion of His Messianic triumphal entrance, He allows Himself to be saluted by the people as the King of Israel (xii. 13); and in the presence of Pilate He admits His Messianic kingdom (xviii. 37; comp. also xix. 19–22).[5] Even for his believing readers it must have been, in the view of the evangelist, a matter of abiding significance for the strengthening and perfecting of their faith, that Jesus wished to be the fulfiller of Israel's promise.

(*c*) It is altogether a mistake when Köstlin, p. 135, asserts that John simply rejects the Mosaic law,[6] as in the synoptical Gospels (§ 24, *c*) Jesus acknowledges the whole law to be binding, in that He condemns the transgression of it (vii. 19). He argues from the supposition that pre-Mosaic circumcision

[5] It is a simple evasion when Baur, p. 393 f., asserts that the Jewish name of Messiah is introduced only as an antiquarian designation; that the Davidic descent of the Messiah is brought forward as a popular Jewish idea (vii. 42); that the entrance into Jerusalem appears to be but an accommodation on the part of Jesus.

[6] As Moses is acknowledged to be a prophet in the sense of note *a* (i. 46, v. 46), then the law given by him (vii. 19, 23; comp. i. 17) can but belong to the revelation of God given by him; and if the γραφή is acknowledged simply in its inviolable authority (x. 35), then the νόμος also belongs to it; indeed, its name, moreover, can but designate the whole Scriptures (x. 34, xv. 25; comp. i. 46), when it is used as the fundamental principal portion of the Scripture.

and observance of the Sabbath have equal authority (vii. 22, 23).[7] He regards the temple as God's house (ii. 16); He repairs to Jerusalem to the feasts, and He abolishes the worship at Jerusalem by worship in spirit and in truth, only for the future (iv. 21), not for the present (ver. 23).[8] For the apostle, to be sure, who, moreover, regarded the high-priestly dignity as so high, that he looked upon the bearer of it as the (unconscious, to be sure) organ of divine prophecy (xi. 51), the abrogation of the Old Testament law was decided to be an event divinely willed by the fall of Jerusalem (comp. § 141, *a*). The objectivity with which He speaks to the Jews of purification (ii. 6), feasts (v. 1, vii. 2), the Passover (ii. 13, vi. 4, xii. 55), shows plainly that these Jewish customs (comp. also xix. 40, 42) found in his circles no longer any observance: for him the hour has already come, when worship in spirit and in truth takes the place of worship at Jerusalem (iv. 21). Yet he knows but the commandment, which is involved even in the evangelical message, and which even already has become old (I. ii. 7, iii. 11; II. 5). But that even in the law of the Old Testament, which also indeed reveals God as the righteous and holy One (comp. § 147, *b*), there is a revelation of truth, if it is but a partial one,—corresponding to

[7] Only on this supposition has the justification of His observance of the Sabbath any sense, inasmuch as Jesus defends it on this ground, that even the anciently holy ordinance of circumcision requires an exception from the Sabbath rest. If He, v. 17, will have the divine Sabbath rest, of which the human is to be a copy (Gen. ii. 3), not to be so understood as to exclude every divine working, then He here but explains the law from the Scriptures themselves, as § 24, *b*, inasmuch as He assumes that the ceaseless working of God is known from them—that working of God on which He proceeds. In this passage, moreover, He vindicates for Himself the right to do as the Father does, only in virtue of His peculiar relation to the Father (comp. § 143, *b*, footnote 3).

[8] When arguing *ex concessis* with Jews He speaks of their law (viii. 17, x. 34), or with the disciples, He shows that even the law, on the ground of which they hated Him without a cause, condemns their hatred as groundless (xv. 25), it does not follow from this that He who, according to iv. 22, knew Himself quite as a Jew, will have nothing to do with this law. It is true that He proclaims a new commandment for His disciples (xiii. 34; comp. § 151, *a*), but not as though the command to love were strange to the Old Testament (comp. § 25, *b*), but because the love which He requires is perfect love, practised after His own example (comp. § 147, *c*). Here, too, the new commandment which brings the perfect revelation of God is but the perfect fulfilling of the Old Testament (comp. § 24).

the preparatory stage of revelation,[9]—is clear from this, that Jesus finds even in the territory of the law those who do the truth (iii. 21), and are of the truth, because they are determined by it (xviii. 37); and that the law was a revelation of God analogous to that of the New Testament, is clear from this, that those who do the truth are in God (iii. 21), and from God (viii. 47), quite as those in whom the New Testament revelation has become operative (§ 150).[10] The law also is, accordingly, a preparatory revelation, just as prophecy. If the latter, by its testimony, fulfils the first condition for the originating of faith, the former fulfils the second (comp. § 149, *b*), in that it works that inner state of mind, which alone makes one receptive of the revelation of God in Christ. He only can know the divine in Christ who is willing to do the divine will (vii. 17), and he only who loves God will do that truly. If the love to God, which is the abiding condition for the normal development of the sacred life, is produced even by the revelation of God in Christ (§ 151, *b*), then must that love to God, which leads to the first knowledge of God, analogously be produced by the preparatory revelation of God.[11]

(*d*) Israel was the place for the revelation of God, which

[9] If John puts the revelation of law by Moses in contrast with the communication of grace and truth by Christ (i. 17), the former is not thereby designated as something unreal and not of God (comp. Köstlin, p. 54), but only in contrast to the commanding revelation of law the perfect revelation is characterized by this, that it brings the gifts of grace to full reality. But, that between the partial truth, which, however, as it rests on divine revelation, involves no untruthfulness, and the perfect truth, there is no distinction expressed, results from the Johannean peculiarity, explained § 141, *c* (comp. footnote 1). Besides this passage, which reminds one of the Petrine use of the word (§ 45, *b*, footnote 3), the idea of χάρις occurs, just as in Revelation (§ 135, *c*), only in the stereotyped prayer for blessing at the beginning of the Epistle (II. 3).

[10] It is even presupposed that the Jews might have been the children of God (viii. 42), and might have been able to love Him (v. 42), had they used aright the Old Testament revelation of God (ver. 39); indeed, this must have been the case, if they had wanted to be receptive of the revelation of God in Christ, for only those who do the truth in God come to the light (iii. 21); only those who are of God and of the truth hear the word of Christ and receive it (viii. 47, xviii. 37), come therefore to faith.

[11] But love to God is, in fact, the fundamental demand of the law (comp. § 25, *b*), and in whomsoever the law had not constantly quickened the opposition of the natural man, as it had done in Paul (§ 58, *b*), that man must it have driven to strive after a fulfilling of the known will of God (vii. 17), as it had

was given in prophecy and in the law, and which, as all revelation of God (i. 4, 9), was brought about by the Logos. Israel is therefore the very people of the Logos (i. 11),[12] and here, too, the saving historical significance of Israel is thereby firmly retained, for which it was prepared by His revelation of God. Because the Messianic salvation comes from the Jews (comp. Rev. xii. 1–5, and therewith § 130, *c*, footnote 4), they on that account possess the knowledge of God (iv. 22). In order that the Messiah may be revealed to the people of Israel, John comes to them with his baptism with water, to prepare for Him the way (i. 31; comp. ver. 23). Jesus confines, quite as in § 28, *d*, His earthly activity to Israel (comp. xi. 51). Briefly, when activity in Samaria was forced on Him rather than sought by Him, He turned at once to His πατρίς (iv. 44); and when He was told that the longing to see Him had arisen among the Greeks (xii. 22), He sees the hour of His glorification come—a glorification which is to become His only by death (vv. 23, 24). His earthly activity was by a divine destination connected with Israel; only after His death could His glorification begin among the Gentiles; only when He has been exalted could He seek to draw *all* unto Him (ver. 32). But, no doubt, He here concludes His activity

done to our apostle, and it must have positively prepared him for the revelation of God in Christ; while in the case of Paul, the law could prepare for Christ only negatively, while it showed that there is no salvation without Him (§ 72, *b*). In James, too (§ 54, *a*), and in a certain sense even in Paul (§ 88, *c*), we found, moreover, love to God, inasmuch as it made receptivity for salvation sure, made to be a condition of salvation; and that the religious moral striving, quickened by the preparatory revelation of God, made one ready to receive the message of salvation, even Peter teaches (Acts x. 34, 35). But while John designates the working of the preparatory revelation of God by the same expressions as those of the perfect revelation in Christ, he sets forth in the strongest way the essential affinity of the two (comp. § 141, *a*), without in any way thereby prejudicing the specific significance of the salvation given in Christ, since He also designates the nature of the thing, at the most diverse stages of development, by the same expressions (§ 141, *c*).

[12] If Israel is called τὰ ἴδια of the Logos, as the apostles are called the οἱ ἴδιοι of the incarnate One (xiii. 1), then it is therein implied that he has chosen the former as well as the latter (xv. 16); and as there is no clear distinction between what belongs to the Father and the Son (xvii. 10), Israel is here, too, the very chosen people of Jehovah, as in the Old Testament. Only under another Old Testament image they appear as the flock of Jehovah (comp. § 45, *a*), which He has enclosed in the fold of the Old Testament theocracy (x. 16), and then even as His household (viii. 35; comp. § 117, *b*).

with the result that all work among the people who had been prepared throughout sacred history for His coming was lost, because this preparation had not in the least attained its end (i. 11).[13] This world-historical fact, which even then was tragically confirmed, had emancipated the apostle inwardly from his people (§ 141, *a*). He speaks of the Jews (*οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι*), but only as the representatives of unbelievers. On the other hand, He assumes that rays of light which the Logos had from the beginning distributed among all men (I. iv. 9), had fallen also on the heathen world, had been there received, and had become effectual. In consequence of which there were here and there scattered, like a dispersion of the true people of God, even children of God there, who require only to be gathered together (xi. 52) and put under the guidance of the Good Shepherd, to whom in their innermost being they belong as His sheep (x. 16). The question finally to be dealt with by Christ is not the distinction of Judaism or heathenism, but is this, whether here and there the preparatory revelation of God, which the Logos had given, had been received, and had restored the inner preparation, which makes one receptive of the perfect revelation of God, and which is shown in the contrast of *ποιεῖν τὴν ἀλήθειαν* and *φαῦλα πράσσειν* (iii. 20, 21).

§ 153. *Victory over the Devil.*

Humanity, as a whole, is appointed to salvation, and requires it, because they are under the dominion of the

[13] The present generation of Israel had not appropriated the word of God (v. 38), as all revelation has to be appropriated if it is to become effectual (viii. 37). And therefore it had not produced in them love to God, and had not made them the children of God (v. 42, viii. 42). They were no doubt Abraham's seed (viii. 37), but not the true children of Abraham in the sense of moral similarity of nature (ver. 39); they did not really belong to Jehovah's flock, which He had given to the chief Shepherd; they were not His sheep (x. 26), which He knew at once as such (vv. 14, 27). They therefore knew Him not when He came to feed His flock (ver. 14), and they believed not (ver. 26). There were no doubt some among them who really belonged to God (xvii. 6, 9), as they had allowed themselves to be made receptive by the preparatory revelation of God, who, as Christ's sheep (x. 14), heard His voice (ver. 3), and followed Him (ver. 27), while they heard (ver. 8) not the voice of false leaders of the people, who would alienate them from Him. But the very people of the Logos, in whole and part, received not Him who came into the world (i. 11).

devil (*a*). The devil is the author of sin, in that he, whose nature is bloodthirsty and false, seduced men to sin, to bring them to destruction (*b*). Those who surrender themselves to the inworking of the devil, and are his children, are unreceptive of the revelation of God in Christ, and fall under the divine judgment of hardening, which Jesus Himself by His appearance accomplishes (*c*). Beyond this circle Christ has broken the power of the devil, and those who believe on Him conquer him (*d*).

(*a*) As the election of Israel in the sacred history does not prevent the Logos from working even in the heathen world, so the whole world of men in general[1] is the object of the divine love, which has been revealed in the sending of the Son (iii. 16). God has sent His Son to them (iii. 17, x. 36, xvii. 18; I. iv. 19), and He has come to them (i. 9, iii. 19, vi. 14, xi. 27, xii. 46, xvi. 28, xviii. 37; comp. I. iv. 1; II. 7), and speaks to them (viii. 26), finally to leave them again (xvi. 28). Humanity as a whole is appointed therefore to salvation, a fact which Scholten, p. 58 f., without reason denies. Christ is the atonement for the whole world (I. ii. 2), and the gaining of them continues the final goal of His prayer (xvii. 21, 23; comp. xiv. 31). But humanity as a whole needs salvation, because they have sin (i. 29); they need light (viii. 12, ix. 5), life (vi. 33, 51), deliverance (iii. 17, iv. 42, xii. 47; I. iv. 14). The reason of this lies in this,

[1] The idea of the κόσμος is accurately defined by John, as with Paul (§ 67, *a*), while elsewhere in the early apostolic type of doctrine, apart from the Gospels (§ 138, *c*, footnote 8), there is indicated a transition to the Pauline conception only in Heb. xi. 7, 38. Only rarely does ὁ κόσμος stand for the universe (xvii. 5, 24, xxi. 25), or for the earthly world (xvi. 21; I. iii. 17; comp. elsewhere, γῆ: iii. 31, xii. 32, xvii. 4), which in most cases is more closely designated as ὁ κόσμος οὗτος (ix. 39, xi. 9, xii. 25, xiii. 1, xviii. 36). The formula ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ εἶναι forms its transition as a designation of the people in this world (i. 10, ix. 5, xiii. 1, xvii. 11; I. iv. 3; comp. xvi. 33, xvii. 13). This also is clearly evident, when the great mass of men as such is called ὁ κόσμος (vii. 4, xii. 19, xiv. 27, xviii. 20), and thus ὁ κόσμος comes to be in the end a technical term for the world of men as a whole. On the ground of this steady *usus loquendi*, even in the passage I. ii. 15, which reminds one so much of Jas. iv. 4, ὁ κόσμος may be but the world of men; at the same time mention is made, ver. 17, of their ἐπιθυμία, and ὁ ποιῶν τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ forms the contrast to it, while the worldly mind, ver. 16, is designated as τὸ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ. Yet here there is no thought of the sum of all individual men, but of the world of men in their God-opposing attitude (comp. § 156, *c*).

that the devil here, as § 23, *a*, rules men as a whole (xiv. 30: *ὁ ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου*). This condition of matters is, to be sure, not necessary in itself, it is only established that it presently exists. Hence the devil is designated as *ὁ ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου τούτου* (xii. 31, xvi. 11); and the world, in so far as in its present condition it is the territory ruled by him, is called *ὁ κόσμος οὗτος* (viii. 23, xii. 31; I. iv. 17). It is the power of the devil, therefore, by which men are ruled when sin enslaves them (viii. 34); then, that this slavery to sin is the result of men's fleshly birth (Schmid, i. p. 241; Frommann, p. 323); of this the passage iii. 6 says nothing, according to § 145, *c*, footnote 12.

(*b*) The devil (*ὁ διάβολος*: viii. 44, xiii. 2; I. iii. 8, 10; *ὁ σατανᾶς*: xiii. 27; *ὁ πονηρός*: xvii. 15; I. ii. 13, 14, iii. 12, v. 18, 19) is not originally an evil being in the dualistic sense, as Scholten, p. 92, yet assumes, following Hilgenfeld (pp. 143, 177). If he sinned from the beginning (I. iii. 8), according to the context, it is only thereby meant that he sinned before men, and hence became the author of their sins, which are designated as his works. Just so may he be the slayer of men from the beginning (viii. 44), inasmuch as he brought about the slaying of men, when his temptations (comp. Rev. xii. 9) brought death on men, death the result of sin (§ 148, *a*). Further, he tempted Cain to commit murder (I. iii. 12), and murder, which he is ever seen to devise, is his work (viii. 38, 41). There is no mention of a fall of the devil, when it is said, viii. 44, that he stands not in the truth; this but expresses the fact that the truth is not the element of his life, by which in his speaking and acting he regulates himself. But when the reason for this is given by saying, that there is no truth (comp. § 147, *b*, footnote 4), *i.e.* no love, no impulse to truth in him, as among the Jews, who did not believe on Jesus, and wished to kill him, on this account, that He told them the truth (viii. 40, 45), then evidently a moral reproach is to be made prominent. It is therewith then given, that what is peculiarly his own (*τὰ ἴδια*), according to which he speaks only lies (ver. 44), belongs to him in no metaphysical sense, but is his own self-condemned moral state. But whether this was in him from the very beginning of his existence, or was established in him

at some one definite moment by his fall into sin, of this John says nothing, and it is altogether foreign to his nature to think on this. But the idea of a strict dualism is simply precluded by his Old Testament monotheism (v. 44, xvii. 3; comp. also Biedermann, p. 131).

(*c*) Although the devil is the ruler of the world, yet has he not the same influence by any means on all men. While the children of God, begotten by means of the preparatory revelation of God, are under his influence, only in so far as they have sin, but otherwise in their deepest nature are ruled by God, there are those also, who, in their deepest being, allow themselves to be ruled by the devil.[4] But the contrast to these two classes of men is not one originally metaphysically determined (Hilgenfeld, p. 141; comp. on the other hand, Biedermann, p. 197 f.); for as to be without God is the result of a historical working of the preparatory revelation of God (§ 152, *c*), the continuance of which was occasioned by the conduct of the Jews to the word of revelation (v. 38, 39), so to be the children of the devil is the result of a historical working of the devil, to whom they have given themselves, and which makes them unreceptive of the word of revelation (viii. 47). No doubt they cannot now hear the word of Jesus, and cannot, therefore, come to knowledge (viii. 43) and to faith (xii. 39), because the prophecy of the divine judgment of hardening (Isa. vi. 9, 10) must be fulfilled in them (ver. 40).[5]

[4] As Cain, whose works were evil, ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ ἦν (I. iii. 12), so is every one ἐκ τοῦ διαβόλου, whose nature it is to do evil (ver. 8). As the Jews are the devil's children (viii. 44), because by their desire to kill (vv. 37, 40), and their lies (ver. 55), or their hatred of the truth, they are essentially like him who is a murderer and a liar from the beginning (vv. 38, 41), so the children of God are in general distinguished in their conduct from the children of the devil (I. iii. 10).

[5] Even the conception of their unreceptiveness as a judgment of hardening presupposes their own guiltiness (comp. Mark iv. 11, 12, and with that, § 29, *d*), and excludes the supposition of an original difference of nature. In their not being able is ever executed but the divine judgment on account of their not wishing (v. 40), the psychological reason given for which, and which condemns it, their want of love to God and their ambition (vv. 42, 44), has no meaning, if it were based on an essential quality of their nature. When it is said, xii. 37, 38, that they believed not, in order that the prophecy of the nation's unbelief (Isa. liii. 1) might be fulfilled, it is at any rate implied by this, that the fact of their unbelief was foreseen in the divine purpose, and had accordingly to come; but the context of the quite analogous passage, xv. 25, shows

Nay, it is Jesus Himself who executes this judgment of God by His appearance (ix. 39);[6] but he explicitly states beforehand that this judgment comes upon them on account of their own sin (ver. 41). But if those who do evil, because they do not wish to be convicted of their sins, hate the light that has come into the world, and flee from it (comp. vii. 7), then is that their judgment (iii. 19, 20), inasmuch as it is therewith decided in their case that they cannot attain to faith, and thereby to salvation (ver. 18). And if the Son gives life to whom He will (v. 21), and if, in complete harmony with the divine will (vi. 40), He gives it only to those who hear His voice and believe (v. 24, 25), then does He in that case exercise the power to judge committed to Him (ver. 27), while He condemns the unreceptive, who heard not His voice, to exclusion from salvation. Finally, here, too, it is but the divine rule, according to which the simple, because they are receptive of the light, are led on by Him to knowledge, the wise are hardened in their unreceptive darkness (Matt. xi. 25; comp. § 29, *d*); by this rule does He execute the judicial decision as to the fate of men (ix. 39).[7]

(*d*) If God, by means of the preparatory revelation, seeks to make men His children, and the devil by means of his temptations seeks to make them his children, then even

that their hatred thus predicted remained inexcusable, and therefore self-condemned sin (vv. 22–24). Even in the betrayal of Judas a divine purpose had to be executed (xiii. 18, xvii. 12), and yet that deed abides a work of the devil (xiii. 2, 27), which Judas did, because he had made himself the organ of the devil (vi. 70).

[6] Indeed, Jesus brings here into sharpest prominence, as in the synoptical tradition (14, *d*), that He has not come to execute the Messianic judgment (iii. 17, xii. 47; comp. viii. 15). But yet, in a certain sense, He must execute this Messianic work, even during His earthly life, in order to show Himself to be the Son sent by God, *i.e.* the Messiah (§ 143, *b*), as He also executed God's judgment of hardening, according to Mark iv. 11, 12. Moreover, since Jesus does not cease to care for unbelieving Jews, and since the evangelist repeatedly mentions that He yet gained over many of them (xi. 45, xii. 11, 42), it is clear that the unreceptiveness of the children of the devil is yet nothing unconquerable, and hence cannot be metaphysically accounted for. Even with Paul, this divine judgment of hardening is nothing final and unchangeable (§ 91, *d*). A child of the devil can cease to be a child of the devil, and can thus become receptive of salvation. But a metaphysical difference of nature between the two classes of men is even shut out by the designing of all men to salvation (note *a*).

[7] In this way the common idea is explained, according to which the appear- of Jesus brings a crisis, in the sense of a separation, between the two classes of

throughout the pre-Christian times there goes on a struggle between God and the devil. Christ is come to lead this conflict to victory, in that He destroys the works of the devil (I. iii. 8). The world's ruler finds in Jesus, who at all times did His Father's will from love (xiv. 31), no room for his lordship (v. 30); Jesus does not in the least belong to the world ruled by him (viii. 23, xvii. 14, 16). Thus is the curse of his rule thereby broken (comp. § 23, *c*), and from this one point may the region ruled by him be reconquered step by step. Jesus has conquered the world that was hostile to Him (xvi. 33), in that He, in spite of all its opposition, has organized a fellowship of disciples, who no more belong to the world, as the territory ruled by the devil (xv. 19, xvii. 14), and has preserved them from the devil and the destruction which he brings (xvii. 12).[8] One only surrenders himself to the devil (vi. 70), and while the devil inspires him with the thought of treachery (xiii. 2), and gives him opportunity to carry it out (ver. 27), he comes to destroy Jesus in death (xiv. 30). But while Jesus in the free obedience of love goes to face death (ver. 31), and now through death returns to the Father, He is proved to be the righteous One (xvi. 10), and the devil is judged because he has slain the righteous One (v. 11), not as though the devil had even now ceased to rule the world. The world in its antagonism to the community of the disciples (xiv. 17, 19, 22, xv. 18,

men (Frommann, p. 660; Köstlin, p. 185 f.; Reuss, ii. p. 499 [E. T. ii. 446]). Such a separation doubtless comes, in that the children of God accept the salvation He brings, while the children of the devil are hardened, and are deprived of salvation. Thus their contrasted positions are made clear, in that they, in the decisive crisis which Christ's appearance introduces, deal with it in opposite ways, and therefore experience opposite results from it. But *κρίσις*, in John, does not on that account designate this separation, but always the judicial decision brought with it, as to the fate of men, as even Scholten, p. 126, footnote, acknowledges.

[8] Otherwise expressed, Jesus brings the light, and although the darkness, produced by the ruler of darkness, sets itself in hostile opposition, to destroy His work (xii. 35), yet it cannot overcome the light (i. 5), rather it is bit by bit conquered by it (I. ii. 8), inasmuch as a condition of light has been established on the earth in the community of believers. The world, on the other hand, has in whole and in part not known Him (i. 10, xvii. 25; comp. *οἱ ἄνθρωποι*: iii. 19, and therewith even § 33, *c*, footnote 5), inasmuch as it has surrendered itself to the dominion of the devil, and hates Jesus, who brings its sin to its consciousness (vii. 7).

19, xvi. 8, xvii. 9, 14–16; I. ii. 15–17, iii. 1, 13, iv. 5), *i.e.* so far as it is and continues to be the world, remains his kingdom, he is and works in it (I. iv. 4), as God and Christ do in believers; they are quite in his power, without wills of their own (I. v. 19). But there is and continues also in the world a holy place, where he can no more disturb the fellowship of those who are born of God, who are inaccessible to his influence (ver. 18), but not by any essential determination of nature, but because they always keep themselves, having been born of God. It is true he ever seeks even yet to destroy them, but God keeps them at Christ's intercession (xvii. 15), and they themselves, being made strong by Jesus' word, overcome the devil (I. ii. 13, 14) and the world united with him (I. iv. 4, v. 4, 5: *νικᾶν*, quite as in Rev., § 135, *b*), the world which is judged with him by Christ's death (xii. 31). But in the proportion in which the exalted One extends His activity to *all* (ver. 32), there opens up the prospect of a final conversion of the world (xvii. 21, 23), which, at least so far as the divine destination is concerned (note *a*), is unlimited, and in that way the complete subjugation of the devil is presented to view.[9]

§ 154. *The Church of the Disciples.*

Those, who by means of the preparatory revelation of God had been made receptive, were given to Christ by God, while God leads them to Him, and teaches them to know Him (*a*). Thus the circle of the first disciples is formed, those disciples

[9] Quite as in Revelation, the history of the Messiah and of His Church is a history of the conflict between God and the devil, who in the end is driven entirely out of his kingdom (xii. 31), only that here he rather looks back to the beginning of that conflict, while in the other the final decision of that conflict is especially kept in view (§ 133, *d*). This point of view is not awanting even in the speeches of Jesus as in the oldest tradition. But if there the contest with daemons as the organs of Satan is rather kept in view (§ 33, *c*), here, where everything is traced back to its deepest principle (§ 141, *c*), this rather external side of that conflict is repeated, only that one has no right on that account, with Frommann, p. 329, to deny that the apostle believes in daemons. Here, too, Jesus denies that He is possessed by a devil (viii. 49; comp. Mark iii. 22, 30), as He had been charged (vii. 20, viii. 48, 52, x. 20; comp. ver. 21). The general Old Testament belief in angels likewise is as little awanting in the Gospel (xx. 12, i. 52; comp. xii. 29), even though v. 4 is undoubtedly a false addition.

whom He had chosen, and appointed to be His messengers, that they may carry forward the work begun by Him to wider issues (*b*). He promises to see them again after His resurrection, to make them sure of their indissoluble union with Him, the Living One, and of His abiding gracious presence (*c*). But that they may be able to perform their work, they receive the promise that their prayers will be heard for everything they ask in His name, and they get also the power to forgive sins (*d*).

(*a*) Those in whom the preparatory revelation of God has achieved its object, and who on that account really belong to God (§ 152, *d*), God gives to Christ (xvii. 6, 9), that He may give them eternal life, and keep them from destruction (xvii. 2, x. 28, 29; comp. vi. 39). The evangelist describes in the apparently accidental finding of the first disciples, how God leads receptive souls to Christ (i. 42, 44, 46); for what God gives Him, comes to Him (vi. 37), sees the Son and believes on Him (ver. 40; comp. with ver. 39). But this is not so to be regarded as though God begot faith in them by an irresistible inner impulse, since, ver. 40, their faith is regarded as expressly brought about psychologically by their seeing. No one, it is true, can come to Him, if the Father does not draw him (ver. 44); but this drawing, according to § 149, *b*, takes place by the effectual testimony necessary for the production of faith, which the Father gives to the Son in the Scriptures and in the works, and by the fact that He teaches men to know Christ as what He is.[1] In this divine giving there is therefore no divine predestination meant, in virtue of which God leads individuals irresistibly and irrevocably to salvation,

[1] Such a teaching is expressively characterized as the drawing of the Father (vi. 45). But whether in conformity with the prophecy (Isa. liv. 13) He equally teaches all, and so those only who on the ground of the receptivity (xvii. 6, 9, x. 27) wrought in them, according to § 152, *c*, hear such teaching and learn, are really drawn to Christ and come to Him (vi. 45). But as God leads souls to Christ, so He unloosens the bonds of their outward fellowship with Him, when the evident want of an effective result from the revelation of God given in Him shows that they inwardly do not really belong to Him, or that they do not abide in Him (xv. 2; comp. vv. 5, 6). There comes a time when those even outwardly depart from Him (vi. 66), of whom Jesus had from the beginning known that they did not belong to Him in truth, although they seemed alike to believe on Him (vi. 64), and even this separation is traced back to a divine destination (I. ii. 19: ἵνα φανερωθῶσιν).

when He works in them receptivity to believe (comp. Köstlin, p. 156), for the whole world is indeed appointed to salvation. It refers only to this, that every result is given to Jesus by God (iii. 27; comp. xix. 11), because He depends on the working of God, a working, however, which does not exclude human receptivity, but presupposes it (comp. § 29, *d*).[2] Jesus therefore comforts Himself in the absence of any result by this, that it is not given to every one to come to Him (vi. 65); but not with a view to deliver from guilt those that fall away, but, according to the context, to establish the fact, that it does not depend on Him and His words, if they believe that they are made to stumble by that word (ver. 60).

(*b*) Those whom the Father has given to the Son are His own true possession (xiii. 1: *οἱ ἴδιοι*), as Israel was originally the peculiar people of the Logos (i. 11). As was the latter, so are they chosen (vi. 70, xiii. 18, xv. 16), and thereby taken out of the whole world of men, to which they too had once belonged (xvii. 6), so that they no longer now belong to it (xv. 19; comp. xvii. 14, 16).[3] No doubt all believers are given by God to Christ, and that also is true specially of all *μαθηταί* in the wider sense (§ 149, *b*, footnote 6). But in our Gospel the Twelve are at the same time the representatives of believers generally (comp. vi. 67); what is special to them consists only in this, that they are the first circle of the disciples; that by them the salvation brought by Christ is to be historically realized more widely in the world. They are to carry forward His work on the earth;[4] Jesus therefore

[2] To be sure, we are not to say, with Frommann, p. 242, that John has satisfactorily solved the problem of the apparent contradiction between man's freedom and his dependence on God. It is rather that, as Reuss, ii. p. 507 [E. T. ii. 453], has properly remarked, that question has not in any way been presented to his consciousness. His conception of salvation as the perfect revelation of God involves even in all its stages of development an act of God, as it likewise demands a reception on the side of the individual.

[3] That this choosing, too, like that divine giving (note *a*), is not irrevocable, vi. 70, xiii. 18 show, according to which even Judas was a chosen one, one given to Jesus by God (xvii. 12; comp. § 135, *c*), which Schenkel, p. 390, denies without reason. This giving by God seems in itself to exclude any free selection on the part of Jesus. But, by the unity of the Son with the Father in the sense of § 143, *c*, the former will choose none other than him, whom the Father brings to Him, as He casts none away whom the Father brings to Him (vi. 37).

[4] Jesus has therefore led them on by degrees from servants with no will of their own, who have to follow their Lord without knowing why He commands

sends them out into the world as the Father has sent Him (xvii. 18, xx. 21). By their word the world is to be brought to believe (xvii. 20), while their testimony comes in the place of His testimony, since they have been with Him from the beginning (xv. 27; comp. § 149, *b*, footnote 5).[5] But their activity will be much more comprehensive than was His own during His earthly life. They will reap what He has sown (iv. 37, 38), they will do greater works than He has done (xiv. 12). His earthly activity was confined to Israel. Only when death had loosed these restraints, will He, like the seed-corn which perishes, bear much fruit (xii. 24), and extend His activity to all (ver. 32); only after His death can the gathering together of the scattered children of God begin (xi. 52). Both can naturally after His death take place only by His disciples, but the speeches of Christ in our Gospel as little contain a direct commission for missionary work among the heathen as does the oldest tradition (§ 31, *a*, footnote 2).

(*c*) To enable the disciples to fulfil the task appointed for them, Jesus promises them that, after the short painful separation by death, they would see Him alive again, and *He them* (xvi. 16, xxii. 14, xviii. 19).[6] This second appearance

them, to be His friends, to whom He has entrusted the whole purpose of the Father, that had been made known to Him (xv. 15), that they may not cease to be δοῦλοι, but that they may begin to be His ἀπόστολοι (xiii. 16). For this end Jesus, by the word of God, which He has declared to them, has made known to them God's name, *i.e.* His whole nature (xvii. 6, 14); and as He has kept them during His earthly life in this name, *i.e.* in the full knowledge of His nature (ver. 12), so will God do Himself henceforth (ver. 11). He will thereby keep them not only from the devil (xvii. 15), but will also consecrate them to their calling, as He has consecrated the Son (x. 36), in the power of His word, the contents of which is indeed the full revelation of God, ἀλήθεια (xvii. 17), since Jesus by His sacrifice has taken care that they, because cleansed from sin, may be put into the position of real consecration to God (ver. 19, and therewith § 148, *b*).

[5] That they may be able to certify this testimony of theirs (comp. § 40, *a*), Jesus has given (xvii. 22) them the glory of miracle-working, which was given to Him, in order to make Him known to the world (§ 145, *a*); and as He has glorified the Father by His work on earth, which was nothing else than giving the perfect knowledge of God (xii. 28, xiii. 31, xvii. 4), so will He do the same also by the advancement of His work by means of the disciples (xv. 8; comp. xiv. 13, xvii. 1).

[6] The current perversion of these passages to a coming of Christ in the Spirit has as a consequence Baur's idea, according to which the Gospel of John generally knows of no appearances of the Risen One, but only of a return of Christ in the

of His, which will be given only to the believing disciples, but not to the world (xiv. 19; comp. Acts x. 41), and will certify to them that His life has come back from death, will also quicken in them a new life (comp. 1 Pet. i. 3), in that they only now quite know that He is in the Father and the Father in Him, because their new life is rooted in Him (xiv. 19, 20; comp. § 143, *c*, footnote 8; 149, *c*, footnote 8). This promise was fulfilled after His resurrection, when Jesus, in virtue of the authority resting on the divine command, had taken again His bodily life (x. 17, 18), that had been given up in death (§ 148, *c*), and now appeared bodily to the disciples, in order to assure them of this corporeity of His.[7] The joy on this account, once kindled (xx. 20), could no more be taken from them (xvi. 22). They could now no more feel orphaned (xiv. 18), because the union with Him who, as the Risen One, was exalted above the limits of finiteness, was subject to no change nor to any more separation. Now would the hour come when He ascended again and returned to the Father (vi. 62). Then was He taken away from remaining on the earth; but when they now kept fast hold of the newly established fellowship with Him in love to Him (§ 149, *c*), then must He ever again make Himself known to them, though in another way than heretofore (xiv. 21). The promise

Spirit (pp. 382–384); or the idea of Schenkel's, by which the Spirit is nothing else than the continued activity of the glorified Christ (p. 395). Comp. on the other hand my *joh. Lehrb.* pp. 273, 279.

[7] The passage x. 17 f.. does not exclude an actual resurrection, since Jesus on the divine command resumes His body, as even ii. 22, xxi. 14 show, passages which on that account Scholten, p. 170, declares to be not genuine. To be sure, He had not any more a concrete body, since the body of those raised, according to New Testament teaching generally, and His own too, was no longer bound by the conditions of earthly matter (xx. 19, 26; comp. ver. 17). But these concrete manifestations were σημεῖα (ver. 30), which was to make them sure of this, that He had risen to a real life (to which, according to the New Testament idea, even a body belonged), as it must have been, according to the Scriptures, if He was really the Son sent by God, *i.e.* the Messiah (ver. 9). The passage ver. 17 does not affirm that He ascended on the day of the resurrection (Köstlin, p. 190; Baur, p. 381), as even Scholten, p. 174, acknowledges; but that He, so long as He yet appeared bodily on the earth, was yet ready to ascend. His appearances are here therefore not appearances of the exalted Christ (as § 138, *b*), but of the Risen One (ver. 14), who is ready to ascend, but yet lingers on the earth, in order by these appearances to complete His work in the disciples. Only when He no longer appears in this sense, is He taken away, and His earthly activity quite concluded.

must be fulfilled which Jesus, even according to the oldest tradition, had left to His Church (Matt. xviii. 20; comp. § 31, *d;* xxviii. 20), that He, and in Him God Himself, would make abode with them (xiv. 23; comp. Rev. iii. 20).[8]

(*d*) The appearance of the Risen One was not to restore any more their earlier intercourse with Jesus, in which the disciples with all their cares came pleading to Him, and He gave to them, or by intercession with the Father got for them, what they required. On that day they will no more ask anything of Him, but they will turn directly to the Father, who will give to them in His stead (xvi. 23). But what they will have to ask after His departure, that is the result of the work entrusted to them, a work which, as with Jesus Himself (note *a*), is a gift of God, and hence must be got by prayer (xv. 7, 8). But in order that they may obtain only what Jesus, so long as He was upon the earth, obtained for Himself (§ 143, *c*, footnote 7), and what He, in that He commissioned them with the carrying forward of His work, will for the future have obtained, they will ask henceforth in His name, *i.e.* in His mission, in His stead (xv. 16, xiv. 13, 14). But this asking in His name can naturally only begin when His earthly work is ended (xvi. 24). If Jesus now promises always a complete hearing to this praying, whether it be that God hears them directly (xv. 16), or whether it be that He mediates it for them (xiv. 13, 14), it is naturally thereby declared that they ask only in the mission and in the stead of Him, who was always sure that His prayers were directly heard (xi. 42). It is this prayer which is the specific prayer of the disciples, with which fruit-bearing has to do in the advancement of the work of Christ.[9] For

[8] By this perfect inward fellowship of believers with Christ, there appears to be no need of this promise of His gracious presence and help. We have even here a true reminiscence of Jesus' words, which are somewhat strange in the specifically Johannean circle of thought (§ 140, *d*), if it is not even irreconcilable with it. Jesus also, in spite of His complete oneness of being with the Father, so long as He as the Son of man is in the world, needed the divine help (§ 144, *c*).

[9] In this sense this promise reminds one of the promise in the oldest tradition, of the hearing of the Church's prayer when assembled for the confession of His name (§ 31, *d*). If, then, a hearing in general is promised to the prayer of faith (§ 20, *b*), *i.e.* to the confident trust in God, then the Church has even with John this confidence towards God (I. iii. 21). If it here seems to be connected with

this advancement of His work it is important not only that new believers be won (xvii. 20), but that they be kept in faith. Since fresh sins are ever occurring, even in believers, which threaten to destroy their possession of salvation, there is no higher object for prayer than the conversion and forgiveness of the sinning brother, by which life is gotten for him (I. v. 16; comp. Jas. v. 15). Thus it is important to know whether such a prayer is yet permissible, or whether the deadly sin has been committed, which leaves no more room for any hope of forgiveness (I. v. 16; comp. § 151, *c*). For this end has the risen Christ given (xx. 22) to the apostles His Holy Spirit (comp. § 145, *d*), that they may be able to distinguish between sins of weakness and deadly sins, and that they may be able to announce forgiveness, or refuse it accordingly (ver. 23).[10]

obedience to the commands of God (ver. 22; comp. ix. 31), then it is clear from the connection with ver. 19 that this comes into notice but as a token that they are of the truth, and therefore stand in the place of disciples (comp. Ritschl, ii. p. 373), as even in the Synoptists only the members of the kingdom (*i.e.* the real disciples) receive that promise. In the passage I. v. 14, 15, this confidence appears connected with this, that we ask according to the will of God, which amounts again to the prayer of the members of the kingdom, inasmuch as their whole efforts are directed to the realization of the divine will (§ 26). But neither is acceptable prayer generally, nor is prayer in the name of Jesus, regarded as conditioned by the gift of the Spirit; for even xvi. 26, 27 is not prayer in the name of Jesus as such, but its directness and confidence connected with the consciousness of the divine love, which is the result of the believing reception of Christ, and this consciousness, if we refer xvi. 25 to the gift of the Spirit, is only in so far brought about by this gift of the Spirit, as it carries forward and perfects the revelation of God given in Christ (comp. § 155).

[10] If, according to the oldest tradition, Jesus gave to the community of the disciples in the wider sense the power of absolution (§ 31, *c*), the exercise of this is here connected with the apostles (Matt. xvi. 19, as also specially with Peter) sent out by Him (ver. 21) plainly in the sense, that their decision as to the distinction between sins of infirmity and deadly sins, may remain for that regulative.

CHAPTER V

THE CONSUMMATION OF SALVATION.

§ 155. *The Paraclete.*

When Christ had finished His work, the Father sends the Holy Spirit as His substitute to believers, to carry forward His work in them (*a*). As the Paraclete, the Holy Spirit is represented as a person in the speeches of Christ in the Gospel, without this idea being assimilated with the Johannean system of doctrine (*b*). This task is, to keep to believers the revelation of God given in Christ, and evermore to appropriate it (*c*). He can testify of the truth to the world only by the instrumentality of believers, and in that way lead it from the sin of its unbelief (*d*).

(*a*) On His going to the Father (xvi. 7), and the heavenly glorification thereby given Him (vii. 39), the apostle makes the sending of the Spirit depend, as Jesus Himself does, and this, to be sure, not because during the earthly life of Jesus the independent activity of the disciples was repressed (Neander, p. 891; Immer, p. 523), nor because the Spirit was as yet connected with His human personality (Frommann, pp. 465, 466; Baur, pp. 384, 385), but because His earthly work was completed only by His final departure to the Father (comp. § 154, *c*, footnote 7), and room was thereby made for the new epoch of the history of salvation, which commences with the sending of the Spirit. It is clear from this, that the promised sending of the Spirit cannot be intended by the breathing on the apostles of the Risen One, when He appeared to them (xx. 22).[1] For as long as Jesus was seen on earth,

[1] This breathing on them cannot, therefore, be strictly the gift of the Spirit (Köstlin, p. 206, and even Kübel, p. 294), or the beginning of it (Schmidt, i. p. 201), because the disciples received it, not as the representatives of believers generally, but as His messengers in particular (ver. 21), while the gift of the Spirit seems to be connected not with one particular calling, but only with faith (vii. 39) and the confirmation of discipleship (xiv. 15, 16; I. iii. 24, iv. 13), and hence it is not given simply to the apostles, as is clear from xv. 26, 27. Even the want of the article shows that it was not the Spirit in the solemn sense that was given to the apostles, but of the Holy Spirit of

He had not yet gone home to His Father (xx. 17); moreover, He nowhere promises that He will give the Spirit directly, but that He will send Him (xvi. 7) from the Father (xv. 26), which, according to xiv. 26, can only be so understood that the Father will send Him at His request (ver. 16); wherefore even in the Epistle the Holy One, from whom Christians have the anointing (I. ii. 20, 27), is God Himself (§ 147, *b*, footnote 5). Quite as little, to be sure, is the gift of the Spirit, as elsewhere in the apostolic preaching (§ 41, *a*; 84, *a*), expressly connected with baptism, of which iii. 5 does not speak. Regard is only had to the fact, that after Christ's departure the Father sends the Spirit in His stead (xiv. 26). The Spirit is to carry forward the work begun by Christ during His earthly life on believers, as His substitute, who needs to be replaced no more by a new one, as He abides for ever in the disciples (xiv. 16, 17; comp. I. ii. 27). The final epoch of the history of salvation begins with the sending of the Spirit.

(*b*) As Christ's substitute, the Spirit is throughout represented as a person in the speeches of Christ in the Gospel, as Christ Himself is. He is the other advocate and patron (*παράκλητος*, *advocatus*), whom God after Christ's departure (who is Himself, I. ii. 1, called *παράκλητος*) gives to believers as their abiding help (xiv. 16), or sends (ver. 26), as He has given and sent the Son into the world (iii. 16, 17). He proceeds from the Father (xv. 26), and comes to them (xvi. 7, 13), as does the Son (xvi. 28); He is received (xiv. 17), as Christ is (xiii. 20), and is in them (xiv. 17) as Christ is in them. He proclaims (xvi. 13–15), testifies (xv. 26), and teaches (xiv. 26), like the Son, nay, His teaching depends on a hearing and receiving (xvi. 13, 14), as do the words of Christ. Jesus speaks of Him throughout, as of Him who carries forward His work in believers, and who stands in a position of complete equality with Him.[2] But there is nothing therewith said of an eternal existence of

Christ, and that, according to § 154, *d*, for a quite special object. Yet it must be admitted that this special equipment of the Spirit is as little expressly brought about by the circle of the other Johannean ideas, as is the descent of the Spirit on Christ Himself at His baptism (§ 145, *d*), and it therefore belongs all the more certainly to the real reminiscences of the evangelist (comp. § 140, *d*).

[2] Hence, also, He stands throughout in equal dependence on the Father, as

the Spirit with the Father, or even of an inherent relation to the Father and the Son. We may from this infer as a logical consequence an ontological trinity, but we are not to seek to infer it from the speeches of Christ, which speak throughout only of the saving historical sending and activity of the Spirit. But if Reuss so represents it, as though in the doctrine of the personal Paraclete, the idea of Christ's fellowship with believers were gradually hypostatized, and this rather speculative way of looking at it only had not yet quite got the better of the popular (ii. pp. 528–533 [E. T. ii. 469–477]), he overlooks the fact, that fellowship with Christ is certainly not thought of as brought about by the Spirit (§ 149, *d*, footnote 12), and that the idea of the Spirit as the personal substitute of Christ is quite *exclusively* peculiar to Christ's speeches. In the Epistle is the Spirit the chrism (comp. Ex. xxix. 7), with which those who have really given themselves to God (§ 152, *d*) are consecrated to be entirely God's (I. ii. 20, 27; comp. § 44, *b*; 54, *b*).[3]

(*c*) The Spirit is Christ's substitute, because He is the Spirit of truth (xiv. 17, xv. 26, xvi. 13; I. iv. 6), *i.e.* because

does the Son, to whom He is in no way subordinated (against Köstlin, p. 110). What He hears He hears of the Father, as Christ does (xvi. 13); and what He hears is the possession of Christ only (ver. 14), in so far as all possessions are common to the Father and the Son (ver. 15). That He comes to testify of Christ (xv. 26), and to glorify Him (xvi. 14), is involved in the very object of His mission, but it testifies of no subjection to Him.

[3] If a teaching activity is ascribed even to the chrism, that is likewise a simple personification, as when, I. v. 6, 7, along with the water and the blood, the Spirit too is regarded as testifying (τὸ μαρτυροῦν). Quite as with Paul (§ 84, *a*, footnote 4), and in the Epistle to the Hebrews (§ 124, *b*, footnote 8), is the Spirit thought of, therefore, as a divine power, *of which* God gives by measure (iii. 34; I. iv. 13; comp. i. 33, vii. 39; I. iii. 24), as the Spirit, which comes from God, but is not a person, but only speaks as the divine power in those who are inspired (I. iv. 1, 2; comp. § 150, *b*). We have here, therefore, the case that a method of representation handed down in the speeches of Christ, has not been so far assimilated by the apostle as to come to be regulative for his own peculiar method of doctrine (comp. § 140, *d*). But if he has not kept fast hold even of the personal character in the representation of the Paraclete, yet has he transferred the recognition of the idea given with Him in the time of the saving historical consummation in so marked a manner to the spirit given to believers, that it appears, vii. 39, as though He did not formerly exist at all. In conformity with this the apostle has also nowhere traced back the preparatory revelation of God to the Spirit, as it yet happens elsewhere (§ 46, *a*; 116, *c*, footnote 4; 127, *b*), and the communication of the Spirit to Christ is accepted only traditionally, according to § 145 *d*.

He possesses the full knowledge of God, or because He is the Truth itself, *i.e.* the communicator of it (I. v. 6), as Christ was (xiv. 16; comp. § 147, *b*). He can have, therefore, but the task to communicate further to believers the revelation of God which had appeared in Christ. He reminds the disciples of all which Jesus had said (xiv. 26); and since abiding in Christ, and therewith the working of the revelation of God, which had appeared in Christ, depends on keeping the words of Christ (§ 149, *c*, footnote 10), so the continuance of the salvation given in Him is secured only by the Spirit.[4] But the Spirit is not only to preserve Christ's work in believers, He is to advance and perfect it. Jesus had not yet been able to tell them much in general, because they were not yet able to bear it (xvi. 12); but the Spirit will teach them all things (xiv. 26), will be their Leader into the whole truth (xvi. 13); so that they now know all things which belong to the full truth, *i.e.* to the full revelation of God (I. ii. 20, 21), and they need no other teacher (ver. 27). Not as though Christ's work were in that way reduced to an imperfect work. All enlightenment of the Spirit will help only towards this, to glorify Him, while it teaches to know Him ever more perfectly (xvi. 14); and it is in that way clear, that the full revelation of God has been already given in Him (ver. 15), and everything which the Spirit announces is but taken from what is His (ver. 14). The new epoch of saving history, beginning with the sending of the Spirit, brings no perfecting of the revelation of God given in Christ, but only an ever fuller appropriation of it. If the Spirit is but He who carries forward the work of Christ, then His whole activity is to be regarded as the maintaining and perfecting of the revelation of God given in Christ, and it must hence be but a revealing

[4] In particular, everything which they came fully to comprehend later (ii. 22; comp. § 140, *c*), the Spirit will have but recalled to them. Much of what Jesus, during His earthly life, had spoken to them of His Father, but in figurative dress, is proclaimed to them in the Spirit, without figure or veils (xvi. 25), as what had been meant in the synoptical speeches of Christ by the figurative announcement of God as the Father (§ 20), the apostle, on the ground of the enlightenment by the Spirit, without figure and veil, now designates as the perfect revelation of the love of God (§ 147, *c*). Even according to I. ii. 27, it is the χρίσμα which by His teaching, in so far as that teaches to know Christ ever anew as the perfect revelation of God, brings about our abiding in God.

activity.[5] Such an activity also does He exercise finally, when, as in Revelation (§ 135, *d*; comp. 139, *d*), He is regarded as the giver of prophecy in the narrower sense (xvi. 13: *τὰ ἐρχόμενα ἀναγγελεῖ ὑμῖν*).

(*d*) As the coming of Christ is conditioned by faith (footnote 1), this coming has no immediate relation to the (unbelieving) world.[6] If, now, He says that the Spirit convicts the world of this, that their unbelief is sin, because Christ has by His return to the Father been shown to be the Just One, and its ruler has been thereby judged (xvi. 8–11; comp. § 153, *d*), as Jesus during His earthly life had convicted the world of its sin (iii. 20, vii. 7), then this can take place only indirectly, in that the Spirit is in believers (I. iv. 2), and by them testifies. Jesus says expressly, that in consequence of the gift of the Spirit (vii. 39) streams of living waters shall come from believers (ver. 38), that a life-giving proclamation is therefore exercised by them, as He had exercised it. This life-giving proclamation is therefore by no means a prerogative of the apostles; rather the testimony which the Paraclete gives

[5] On the other hand, the Spirit is never, as exclusively with Paul (§ 84, *a*), regarded as the principle of the new moral life, since, according to the fundamental view of the apostle (§ 141, *d*), the perfect knowledge of God, given by Him, of itself works the new moral life (§ 147, *c*). In this way it is explained why Jesus' expression, recorded iii. 5, which points to the Messianic outpouring of the Spirit (i. 33), and regards it as the starting-point of the moral new birth, is no further appropriated and turned to account (§ 150, *c*, footnote 7). The full joy of believers is not, as with Paul (§ 83, *c*), a work of the Spirit, but a result of abiding in Christ (xv. 11), of their own prayers being heard (xvi. 24), and of Christ's intercession (xvii. 13); and while the Master, when departing, only promises the Spirit to the disciples (xiv. 26), He bequeaths to them directly His peace (xiv. 27, xvi. 33). Elsewhere *εἰρήνη* occurs in the sense of a Jewish good wish (xx. 19, 21, 26; II. 3; III. 15; comp. § 83, *b*). If the Spirit, vi. 63, is the life-giving One, then this life is, in the specifically Johannean sense, the life of the true knowledge of God; and there is no mention of the Paraclete, but of His words, life-giving from their very nature (§ 146, *d*).

[6] If God wished even to send His Spirit to it, it *could* not yet receive Him (xiv. 17), since the fact that it had not received Christ establishes its unreceptiveness for the revelation of God. If it has not learned to see and know Christ as what He is, so still less will it be able to see and know the Spirit as the Spirit of Truth, who is the organ of the revelation of God; while by believers, who know indeed from Him, according to I. iv. 13, that God abides in them, He is known immediately as what He is,—namely, as the Spirit of God,—because in the fact that He now abides with those, and in those, in whom He finds the right receptivity, they have the immediate experience of His existence (*θεωρεῖν*), and so know His nature intuitively (xiv. 17).

by believers as such (xv. 26) is expressly distinguished from the testimony of eye-witnesses (ver. 27).[7] If there are those only, to be sure, who have believed through the apostolic word (xvii. 20), then this distinction ceases. They have believed the eye-witness of the apostles, without having seen Jesus (xx. 29), and given it, further, as they have received it: it has become in them, connected with the testimony of the Spirit, to be the confession that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, or that He is the Son of God (I. iv. 2, 15). Thus may all believers be fellow-workers in the service of the truth (III. 8).

§ 156. *The Fellowship of Believers.*

According to its nature, the fellowship of believers forms a living unity, in virtue of their fellowship with God and Christ (*a*). Love, as Christian brotherly love, is realized in it, without being therein exhausted (*b*). From the hatred of the world it is threatened with its deadly enmity, and from its sin and falsehood with seduction, which endangers the love in it (*c*). The world ever the more sternly withdraws from the fellowship of believers, so that little more is to be hoped for them (*d*).

(*a*) From the fellowship of the chosen eye-witnesses there grows up through their preaching the fellowship of believers

[7] Apart from the breathing on them, meant for a special object (xx. 22, 23; comp. § 154, *d*), John, as does also the rest of the New Testament, knows nothing of a special apostolic inspiration. It is true the single promise of the Spirit, in the synoptical tradition, has reference specially to an activity of the apostolic calling (§ 21, *c*, footnote 1). But the activity of the Spirit in the proclamation of the gospel is, § 41, *d*, 46, *a*, by no means confined to the circle of the apostles, even with Paul (§ 89, *b*, footnote 8), only in a sense which does not exclude the inspiration of others (§ 92, *b*). Even in I. v. 6 (comp. ver. 5) it is believers by whom the Spirit, which is Truth, as the first Witness, bears witness of the divine sonship of Christ, as Christ Himself once, by the offering of Himself in word and work, had borne witness (§ 149, *b*); but the witness of the water and the blood must be added to it (vv. 7, 8), *i.e.* the witness of those who have even seen the miracle of the baptism (i. 34), and of the death on the cross (xix. 35), that witness may be thereby borne (I. v. 6) not only to the nature of the Divine Son, but even to His manifestation in the flesh, in its whole compass (§ 145, *c*, footnote 11), as a historical fact. And, I. iv. 14, the witness of the eye-witnesses, in its agreement with the witness of the Spirit (comp. § 151, *b*, footnote 5), appears explicitly as an evidence that God Himself by this Spirit dwells in us.

(I. i. 3: *ἵνα καὶ ὑμεῖς κοινωνίαν ἔχητε μεθ' ἡμῶν*). The community of the disciples, that is to say, forms a unity (xvii. 11) to which believers, won by the truth, then join themselves (vv. 20, 21, 23). But this unity is not only a being united in love, or a likeness of mind; for it is produced by this, that the disciples are kept in the full knowledge of God (*ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί σου*); and as this unity is true life (§ 146), that unity is a unity of life which corresponds to the living unity of the Father and the Son (ver. 11: *καθὼς καὶ ἡμεῖς, scil. ἕν ἐσμεν*; comp. ver. 22). The more their fellowship with the Father and the Son is realized, the more completely is their unity with one another perfected (ver. 23: *ἵνα ὦσιν τετελειωμένοι εἰς ἕν*),[1] and the joy of believers becomes thereby ever more perfect (xv. 11, xvii. 13). Thus John has from his own peculiarity (§ 141, *c*) characterized what elsewhere in the New Testament is called the *ἐκκλησία*, only according to its deepest nature, while, on the contrary, no hints are given by him as to its outer organization.[2] In the

[1] As the Father and the Son are one, because the life of the full knowledge of God is common to them (vi. 57, v. 26), so are believers one, because this revelation of God in Christ, which the eye-witnesses have further proclaimed, has made this life common to them. Only if believers walk in the light of the knowledge of God (which brings with itself the true life, and therefore fellowship with the Father and the Son) have they fellowship with one another (I. i. 7), and in this fellowship of theirs is realized fellowship with God and Christ (ver. 3: *ἡ κοινωνία ἡ ἡμετέρα [scil. κοινωνία] μετὰ τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ μετὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ*). As the unity of the Father and of the Son depends on this, that the Son is in the Father, and the Father in the Son, so the unity of believers depends on this, that through their mystical union with Christ they are in the Father (xvii. 21), and that the Father, who is in the Son, is in them (ver. 23). But even the *perfected* unity of believers with God (in Christ) is not even, on that account, to be put on a level with the unity of the Son with the Father (§ 143), because this latter is an immediate unity; the former is mediated by the Son, on which account it is nowhere expressly said that they are one being with God. But it follows in general from § 141, *c*, that even the similarity of expression (as it occurs, at least, in believers being in God, and God being in them) in no way justifies us in putting both on the same level.

[2] The name *ἐκκλησία* occurs, III. 6, 9, 10, of a local church. The *Κυρία*, to which the Second Epistle is addressed (II. 1), and which is without doubt a church, is called, as by Peter (§ 44, *a*), elected (ver. 13), inasmuch as every single church, like the first church of the disciples (§ 154, *b*), is chosen out of the world. The assertion that in the Fourth Gospel Peter is put after John from a tendency, becomes void of itself if the Gospel is apostolic, and if the beloved disciple has put into it his dearest memories. In the appendix to the Gospel (xxi. 15–17) the apostolic office of shepherd is given anew to Peter when

speeches of Christ in the Gospel, the church of believers is the vine-stock which God has planted (xv. 1), as the Old Testament theocracy was once the vine-stock (Ezek. xix. 10; Jer. ii. 21; Ps. lxxx. 9), and God's flock, whose shepherd is Messiah (x. 1–15; comp. § 45, *a*); but even here the perfecting of it lies in this, that there is one flock and one shepherd (ver. 16). In this fellowship, which is in this way the perfected theocracy, just as in Revelation (§ 130, *c*), believers possess the Messianic blessing of the forgiveness of sins through the blood of Christ (I. i. 7; comp. § 148, *b*, footnote 4). The giving of this by means of baptism or the Lord's Supper is nowhere expressly thought of,[3] only we are not to venture to conclude from this, with Messner, p. 357, any abolition of these two external means of participation in salvation. These retain their full significance, even if the tendency of the apostle to look at the innermost centre of the spiritual life (§ 141, *d*) allows him but to inquire after the process of the appropriation of salvation there being completed.

(*b*) In the fellowship of believers, in virtue of fellowship with God there abiding in their unity, is realized the nature

he has been converted again to love to Christ after his deep fall, without any chief leadership of the Church being implied in the expression, such as was believed to be given him, § 41, *d*, footnote 4. It is only, in the first place, implied by the figure, as x. 9, 10 shows, that he feeds the Church with the word of life (comp. § 106, *a*, footnote 4). As Peter calls himself the *συμπρεσβύτερος* of the elders (1 Pet. v. 1), so John calls himself simply the *πρεσβύτερος* (II. 1; III. 1), and upholds his authority against ambitious strivings (III. 9, 10). The way in which, I. ii. 27 (comp. ver. 21), every special office of teaching seems to be excluded, reminds one very much of Matt. xxiii. 8–10 (§ 31, *c*), and of the prophecy Jer. xxxi. 34 (comp. Heb. viii. 11, and therewith § 124, *d*).

[3] The Gospel speaks of the continuation of John's baptism by Jesus, or rather by His disciples (iii. 22, iv. 2); but the expression, iii. 5, applies neither to John's nor to Christian baptism, but with an allusion to Old Testament promises (Ezek. xxxvi. 25–27) demands a complete renewal, by the purification from former sins, a purification of which water is the symbol (xiii. 10), and by the Messianic baptism of the Spirit (i. 33). The Gospel as little has any express command of Jesus to believers to perform this rite of baptism as the oldest tradition has (§ 31, *b*, footnote 4). It does not record even the institution of the Lord's Supper. To refer the words vi. 53–56 to the Supper is simply forbidden by the fact, that the words refer not to the *σῶμα*, but to the *σάρξ* of Jesus, and eating and drinking the flesh and blood is enforced as necessary for begetting the new life (ver. 53), a life which in the Gospel throughout comes immediately with faith (comp. § 146, *a*). In the passage I. v. 6 (comp. § 145, *c*, footnote 11), one must not think of the two sacraments at all.

of sonship to God, or of moral similarity of nature to God, whose nature is known in the perfect revelation of God as love (§ 147, *c*). But the love which Jesus demands from His disciples on the ground of this revelation, is, after His own example, self-sacrificing love towards one another (xiii. 34, 35, xv. 12, 17: *ἀγαπᾶτε ἀλλήλους*), and the command of Christ is likewise characterized by the apostle as love to one another (I. iii. 11, 23, iv. 7, 11, 12; II. 5). Believers, that is to say, are brethren to each other (I. iii. 13; III. 3, 5, 10; comp. xx. 17, xxi. 23); and the demand of brotherly love (I. ii. 9, iii. 10, 14–17, iv. 20, 21) is expressly based on this, that their being born of God works necessarily, with love to God who begets, love also to those who are begotten (v. 1, 2). To be sure, love is also spoken of simply as the fruit of God's revelation of love (I. iv. 16, 19; comp. ver. 8); and since God has revealed His love even to the *κόσμος* (John iii. 16), then love in its nature is not to be confined, as by Köstlin, pp. 233, 234; Reuss, ii. p. 543 [E. T. ii. 486], to brotherly love, as then, too, the hater of a brother incurs punishment not only as a killer of the brother, but even as a killer of men generally (I. iii. 15).[4] But the exhortation is doubtless confined to brotherly love as such, because in it the full nature of love can be unrestrainedly realized (comp. note *c*). If in the New Testament throughout love is the cardinal Christian virtue, yet in the apostle of love (§ 141, *d*) it appears in quite a special way as the especial substance of Christian morality (§ 151, *a*), and that as active love (I. iii. 8).

(*c*) The world, or humanity remaining in unbelief (§ 153, *d*), stands in sharpest opposition to the fellowship of the children of God, who are only so in the world (I. iv. 17), that they,

[4] There is really no narrowing of love implied in the passage xvii. 9, referred to by both, where Jesus says that He prays not for the world in general, but only that the reason of His prayer for the disciples is this, that they do not belong to the world (vv. 14, 16), but are God's own possession given to Him, and for whom He can therefore claim God's special care (comp. also ver. 25, and therewith § 147, *b*, footnote 5). But that, I. iii. 15, after Jesus' example (Matt. v. 22), hatred is made equivalent to murder (comp. Jas. iv. 2), corresponds quite with the peculiarity of the apostle explained § 141, *c*, according to which every lack of love is identical with hatred (I. ii. 9–11, iv. 20; comp. John iii. 20, xii. 25).

like Christ Himself, no longer in truth belong to the world (xvii. 14, 16). Because believers no more belong to it, those whose very nature is self-love cannot love them (xv. 19; comp. vii. 7), and, according to the contrast in principle, in which the world, as ruled by the devil, stands to the Church of the children of God, they must hate them; for there is no third thing for John (footnote 4).[5] But the world threatens believers not only with its enmity, but ever more with its temptation (I. ii. 26, iii. 7; II. 7). Believers, too, must be warned to shun the idols the world worships (I. v. 21; comp. § 131, *b*), and they are warned against love to the world (I. ii. 15, and therewith § 153, *a*, footnote 1), because love in that way very easily gets associated with the sinful lusts which are common in the world (ver. 16).[6] But now even antichristian false prophecy also belongs to the world (comp. § 131, *b*), which in apostolic times threatened the Church (II. 7; I. iv. 1), and which found the world's approbation (ver. 5: ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου εἰσίν . . . καὶ ὁ κόσμος αὐτῶν ἀκούει). These had no doubt gone out from the Church; but in their fall by a divine law, it had to be made manifest that its organs had never really belonged to the Church (I. ii. 19). In them it is shown that the devil, who was a murderer and a liar from the beginning, threatens the Church not only with the deadly enmity of the world, but also with its soul-destroying lies (ver. 22); yet the Church possesses in its faith the power to overcome the world (I. iv. 4, 5, v. 4, 5). But here, too, it is clear how in the nature of the world love finds its limits. We cannot show brotherly love to false teachers, without running the risk of making ourselves partakers in their sins (II. 10, 11).

[5] As they had hated Christ (xv. 18, 25), so must they, according to the prediction of Jesus (xv. 19, 20, xvii. 14), hate and persecute His servants (xv. 20) for His name's sake (ver. 21) even to blood (xvi. 2). The apostle stands in the middle of this experience of the world's hatred of believers (I. iii. 13), the terrible outbreak of which forms the dark background of the Apocalypse (§ 113, *a*).

[6] If, therefore, it is not permissible to the nature of love to exclude the persons of individual unbelievers from love (note *b*), yet love cannot unrestrainedly develop itself towards the world as the fellowship hostile to God, without being exposed to the danger, that godlike love to the world, as that which has to be delivered, may become an ungodlike love of the world, *i.e.* a love for the world in its position as opposing God.

(*d*) In spite of this sharp contrast between the world and the Church, the Spirit is ever seeking by means of believers as His organs to lead the world from its sin of unbelief, and to testify to it of Christ. Likewise by the self-sacrifice of the Church in her perfected unity is kept in view that final winning of the world (xvii. 21, 23; comp. Rev. iii. 9: *ἵνα γνῶσιν ὅτι ἐγὼ ἠγάπησά σε*, and especially § 132, *a*), which is to realize the universal saving purpose of God. But as even Christ's ἔλεγξις in the world remained in whole and in part without result (iii. 19, 20), so when, in consequence of the exaltation of the Son of man, from which even Jesus looked for the principal result (viii. 28), there was won from the world for the Church all that was yet receptive in it, the apostle sees little more to hope for for the world. The self-sacrifice of the Church it does not understand, because it cannot know the children of God as such without the knowledge of God (I. iii. 1). It hears not the Spirit of Truth, because it hears the false prophecy of the false teachers, who are essentially allied to it (I. iv. 5, 6). Like the author of the Apocalypse (§ 130, *c*, footnote 5), the apostle seems to have no more expected any great result from missionary work. It was involved in his nature, which was not fitted for any outwardly influential work (§ 141, *b*), that to his view the Church was presented rather as a circle essentially complete in itself over against the world. It was implied also in his historical position, that the closer the end approached, the more was the gathering together of the children of God scattered throughout the world (xi. 52) regarded as concluded, and the world, in so far as it remained the world, appeared as a fellowship setting itself, on the whole, hostile to salvation.[7] This of itself leads on to the eschatology of the apostle.

[7] The apostle has certainly not taken any apocatastasis in view. In the passage xii. 32 it is only said that Christ extends His activity to all; but as little as the ἑλκύειν of the Father (vi. 44) does His ἑλκύειν attain its end in all. But the conquering of Satan in the end (§ 153, *d*) nowhere involves in the New Testament a conversion of all men, but only of such as will let themselves be converted, as even in Paul (§ 99, *c*). Moreover, even in the oldest tradition of Jesus' speeches the world as such remains unbelieving, and proportionably but a few from it will be saved (§ 33, *c*, footnote 5). It is also yet but a few, x. 16, whom Jesus calls even now His own in the Gentile world, if, even according to § 153, *c*, footnote 6, many who are now the children of the devil may be won from it.

§ 157. *The Last Day.*

According to John's Gospel, Jesus has also promised His near return, and the apostle thinks of it as immediately at hand (*a*). He recognises the approach of the last hour by the appearance of the pseudo-prophecy of the false teachers, in whom antichrist has already appeared (*b*). The day of the second coming, as the last day, brings the resurrection of the dead and the judgment of the world, which finally decides the fate of men (*c*). Believers then enter into the heavenly life, when through the perfect vision of God they are made perfectly like God (*d*).

(*a*) If Jesus promises after He has gone to His Father's abode (*i.e.* to heaven; comp. Ps. xxxiii. 13, 14; Isa. lxiii. 15), in order there to prepare a place for His own, that He will come again to take them home (xiv. 2, 3), that can but be understood of His second coming promised throughout in the New Testament, and of the gathering together of the elect in Christ resulting from it, according to § 33, *c*.[1] As in the oldest tradition (§ 33, *a*), Jesus speaks here, too, on the supposition that the disciples will survive to this second coming, and only the explicit addition, which He is said to have made to the beloved disciple in this connection (xxi. 22), after He had predicted a martyr's death for Peter (vv. 18, 19), is in the appendix to the Gospel, and that is established not by any change on the ἔρχομαι, but by a reference to their hypothetical conception (ἐὰν . . . θέλω) against a contingent coming of an apparent non-fulfilment (ver. 23). On the contrary, the apostle himself even in his old age hopes with his contemporaries to survive till the Parousia, and he exhorts them to abide in Christ, that none may recoil being ashamed at His coming (I. ii. 28), because he will not belong to those who will go home with Him. It is clear that in this way

[1] The modern idea of a taking each individual soul home immediately after death (Köstlin, p. 280; Reuss, ii. p. 557 [E. T. ii. 499]), is excluded by the idea of a resurrection at an appointed day (note *c*), which is here held firm. The idea that in John's Gospel the visible second coming of Christ is changed into His second coming in the spirit (comp. yet Schenkel, p. 393), is supported by the current false interpretation of the promises of His second coming after death, and of His abiding gracious presence (§ 154, *c*).

the apostle himself has applied the promise of Jesus (xiv. 3) to the general apostolic hope of the Parousia.

(*b*) That the second coming of Christ is immediately at hand the apostle knows from this, that his present bears the marks of the last time (ἐσχάτη ὥρα),[2] but we know the existence of the last time by the coming of antichrist (I. ii. 18). As Paul (§ 63, *c*) and the author of the Apocalypse, so, too, does the apostle proceed on the supposition that the second coming of Christ cannot come till the God-opposing and Christ-hating power has become potentialized and concentrated in the highest degree in a historical appearance. His readers have heard from him that antichrist comes (I. ii. 18, iv. 3). But if antichristianity appeared in the Apocalypse in the two forms of a God-hostile worldly power and of false prophecy, and was to win its personal concentration in the region of the former (§ 131), so here false prophecy is (I. iv. 1, 3) alone the antichrist (I. ii. 22; II. 7: ὁ πλάνος καὶ ὁ ἀντίχριστος). If there false prophecy, at least preponderatingly, comes from heathenism, as with Paul it comes from Judaism, so here it springs up, as moreover it does partly even in the Apocalypse (comp. Rev. ii. 20, 24), from degenerate Christianity, which, according to § 156, *c*, also belongs to the God-hostile world. The fears with which the author of the Apocalypse regarded the coming of the third Flavian to the throne have not been fulfilled in this extent, and the whole ideal tendency of the apostle led him to direct his view away from the external dangers of the Church to her inner risk, by a false doctrine denying the fundamentals of the Christian faith, and to see in it the fulfilment of the prophecy of antichrist.[3]

[2] As the natural day has twelve hours, so the day of each life has the number of its hours measured out by God (xi. 9; comp. ix. 4), and so also the day of the present world (ὁ κόσμος οὗτος: § 153, *a*, footnote 1).

[3] There is implied no spiritualizing of the doctrine of antichrist (Reuss, ii. p. 562 [E. T. 503]) in the fact that antichrist appears as a multitude of false teachers (I. ii. 18; II. 7); for even in the Apocalypse false prophecy appears as a collective power. In the plurality of the false prophets (I. iv. 1) there works but the one spirit of antichrist (ver. 3), who, because he is not of God, can be only from the father of lies (viii. 44), as he there makes those inspired by him to be liars (I. ii. 22), and, according to I. iv. 4, the ruler of the world, *i.e.* the devil, is in them overcome. But as Judas, who made himself to be the devil's organ, is himself called a devil (vi. 70), so these false teachers as organs of

(*c*) With the second coming of Christ the last day of the present age of the world dawns (*ἡ ἐσχάτη ἡμέρα*). Jesus, even in our Gospel (vi. 39, 40, 44, 54), promises the Messianic resurrection of the dead on this day (xi. 24), and He designates Himself as the author of that resurrection (xi. 25).[4] But from these passages it is clear that here too, as with Paul (§ 99, *b*; comp. § 126, *d*, footnote 7), there is a resurrection in the special sense only for believers, who, according to John, have already received eternal life, and for whom therefore the bodily death which they have experienced must in the end be taken away, not only in the sense of § 146, *a*, but completely (xi. 25, 26).[5] But with this decision comes also the final (Messianic) judgment, which the Father has given over to the Son, beyond what He has already executed even in His earthly life (v. 27), because, according to ver. 22, He has expressly assigned to Him the *whole* judgment.[6] Believers, to be sure, do not now come into this judgment (iii. 18, v. 24), inasmuch as they have already received eternal life in faith, and therefore it cannot be decided for the first time regarding them, whether they are to receive it, and the world is even judged (iii. 18, xii. 31), because by their unbelief they have shut

antichristianity, or of the devil in his conflict with Christ (§ 153, *d*), are themselves *ἀντίχριστοι* (I. ii. 18). On the contrary, the idea that these antichrists are but the forerunners of the personal antichrist is a pure prejudice, which entirely contradicts the terms of the Johannean passages.

[4] By this fact all attempts are wrecked to withdraw the Johannean eschatology from the general early apostolic basis, as the utterly abortive attempts of Reuss (ii. p. 558 [E. T. ii. 499]) and Baur (p. 405) evidently show; Scholten (pp. 124–126) has even conceded that while he seeks by arbitrary false explanations of the words to help it, only by a resurrection can the soul (as the bearer of the earthly life) that has been given up be kept (as the bearer of the eternal life) (xii. 25).

[5] Hence it is said, v. 28, 29, that the Messiah, when this hour comes, calls all from their graves, the one to the resurrection of life, the other to the resurrection of judgment. But we need not therefore change this passage into a moral sense (as Schenkel, pp. 392-396), or explain it as interpolated, with Scholten, p. 129 f. We have here rather the general resurrection of the dead, which we found, with the exception of Acts xxiv. 15, only in the Apocalypse (§ 132, *b*); but even here it is clear that only believers, who have the true life, and therefore are necessarily those *τὰ ἀγαθὰ ποιήσαντες*, rise to life only in the special sense, and therefore in the New Testament sense, while unbelievers only experience a resurrection so as to be placed before the judgment, which takes place on the last day (xii. 48).

[6] Christ is here too, therefore, the judge of the world. There is throughout in this implied no rejection of the usual idea of judgment, when, according to xii. 48, His word is said to be the judicial rule (comp. Reuss, ii. p. 559 [E. T.

themselves out from salvation.[7] But inasmuch as the abiding possession of eternal life (I. iii. 15) yet actually depends, even for believers, on this, whether he continues in Christ (comp. § 151, *c*), so his decision depends on this at the last day (xii. 48), or on the day of judgment (I. iv. 17). On the other hand, there continues, even for the world, the possibility of conversion up to the last moment (§ 156, *d*), and only the world, in so far as it remains the world, perishes, so as never to come to life (I. ii. 17). It is clear from this that even here the resurrection of evil-doers (v. 29; comp. footnote 5) is to be understood, so to say, *κατ' ἀντίφρασιν*, inasmuch as it is raised, not to life, but to be delivered over to abiding death (I. iii. 14). This death, which is equivalent to eternal destruction (§ 148, *a*), is also the fate of apostate Christians (I. v. 16), and is compared (xv. 6) to the fire which consumes the cut away branches (comp. § 34, *d*).[8] It is the second death of the Apocalypse (§ 132, *b*).

(*d*) The final consummation with John is without doubt a heavenly one. As Christ came from above (iii. 31, viii. 23), so has He gone to heaven, and comes to take His own thither (xiv. 2, 3). Thither the unbelievers cannot follow Him

ii. 501]; Schenkel, p. 392), since it is but self-evident that the conduct toward the perfect revelation of God which is given in His word brings on the final decision as to the fate of men. From another point of view, Moses may be the accuser in this judgment (v. 45), inasmuch as he has testified of Christ (ver. 46). If in this passage, as viii. 50, God appears as the judge, and xvii. 25 His judicial righteousness is appealed to (comp. § 147, *b*), it only follows from this that the judgment which the Messiah holds when He comes again, executes God's will as He does it even in His present judging (v. 30), and that it is conformable to this will if the conduct towards Christ finally decides in it (viii. 50: *ἔστιν ὁ ζητῶν, scil. τὴν δόξαν μου*).

[7] But this is nothing else at bottom than when Paul announces the future salvation as already present, because all its conditions are given (§ 96, *b*), or when the Epistle to the Hebrews makes all the members of the new covenant come to the heavenly Jerusalem (§ 117, *d*). But the idea of judgment in the common sense is therefore by no means denied, as even Köstlin, p. 281, Baur, p. 405, assert.

[8] So far as it is permissible to translate this parabolic figure into a definite idea, it is the judicial wrath of God under which the rebellious fall, as that wrath, according to iii. 36, abides on him who refuses faith to the Son. It is yet characteristic that only in this expression of the Baptist is the *ὀργὴ θεοῦ* expressly spoken of, which here is by no means regarded simply eschatologically, since Ritschl, ii. p. 152 f., seeks in vain to prove from vi. 56, ix. 41, that according to the Johannean *usus loquendi* something must remain which did not exist before.

(vii. 34, viii. 21, xiii. 33). But He has promised His own that they are to be where He is (xii. 26, xvii. 24). Eternal life therefore begins in heaven,[9] so far as it is by John regarded as a life yet future (comp. § 148, *c*). But as eternal life begins even in the present life, seeing that God is seen in Christ, so eternal life in the future life can only consist in this, that the original glory of Christ is seen (xvii. 24), and God no longer in the revelation of Him in Christ, but He is Himself seen *as He is* (I. iii. 2; comp. § 34, *b*; 132, *d*). And as the final working of the perfect revelation of God in Christ was, that believers become *like* Him as His children, so the result of that perfect vision of God must be that we shall become like Him (*ὅμοιοι αὐτῷ ἐσόμεθα, ὅτι ὀψόμεθα αὐτὸν καθώς ἐστιν*).[10] If eternal life is already given in this life, then the glory of the future can add nothing to what constitutes the real being; it can only bring that given in it to highest completion, even where, according to § 141, *c*, the distinct step in this consummation is not indicated in the expression. How glorious this consummation will be is not yet revealed (I. iii. 2); but that it will come, Christian hope assures us of this (ver. 3).[11] So the first word of the Gospel becomes the last word of the last of the apostles. As

[9] Only with Peter (§ 50, *c*; comp. also § 110, *b*) is the final consummation so completely a heavenly thing as it is here; but it is altogether connected with it, that there is no express reference to the transformation of the world, taught elsewhere throughout in the New Testament. But as, according to I. ii. 17, not only the ungodly world of men, but even the objects of their lusts, pass away, there is thus thereby indicated the overthrow of the present form of the world, the very name of which (*ὁ κόσμος οὗτος*) points to this, that another will come, in which the present distinction between heaven and earth will be taken away (comp. § 132, *d*). Eternal life forms the contrast to *κόσμος οὗτος*, xii. 25.

[10] Even with Paul the completion of sonship is the hope of Christians, inasmuch as in virtue of adoption we are made partakers in the inheritance of the divine glory (§ 97, *c*), but this inheritance consists essentially in the heavenly spiritual form of body, to which there is no allusion here; rather he puts the vision of the divine glory into the consummation of the likeness of God peculiar to the perfected children of God (Matt. v. 9, and therewith § 34, *b*) in virtue of their being born of God. But it is said even by Paul that we are changed by the vision of the glory of Christ into His image (2 Cor. iii. 18), so that the spiritual form of life, which is here produced by the believing reception of the gospel of His glory, becomes in the end the spiritual form of body in the future life (*ἀπὸ δόξης εἰς δόξαν*). Comp. § 86, *c*, footnote 7.

[11] Christian hope as such (*ἐλπίς*) is expressly named only in this passage. But however much the expectation of this goal of completeness may run back with

the kingdom of God which Jesus founded on earth is the security for the completion of the coming one (§ 15, *c*), so the beginning of the realization of the New Testament will of God (Lev. xi. 44) in our state of sonship (ver. 2 : *νῦν τέκνα Θεοῦ ἐσμέν*) becomes the security for the blessed ending which we hope for in the future.

John to the full blessed experience of the salvation already given by faith, there is yet for him a hope, which lies in the future, when the latter may bring the ever more glorious completion of what is even here given, and is thereby confirmed in its completion.

INDEX.

Gosp. indicates Part First; Acts, Pet., James, the three sections of Part Second; Pl. I. II. III. IV. the four sections of Part Third; Heb. Pet. ii. (including Jude), Rev., Gosp. II., the three sections of Part Fourth; John, Part Fifth; (I.) and (II.) vol. I. and II. respectively.

	VOL.
ABRAHAM—	
Jas. § 53, *d*,	(I.)
Pl. II. § 72, *d*,	(I.)
§ 82, *b*, footnote 5,	(I.)
§ 82, *c*, footnote 8,	(I.)
Heb. § 115, *a*,	(II.)
§ 125, *b*, footnote 4,	(II.)
John, § 152, *a*,	(II.)
Absolution. *See* Pardon.	
Gosp. § 31, *c*,	(I.)
John, § 154, *d* (footnote 10),	(II.)
Adam (Adam's fall and its consequences)—	
Pl. II. § 67,	(I.)
John, § 153, *b*,	(II.)
Adam (Second)—	
Pl. II. § 79, *a*,	(I.)
(Comp. Gosp. II. § 138, *b*, footnote 7),	(II.)
Adiaphora—	
Pl. II. § 93, *c*, *d*,	(II.)
IV. § 110, *a*, footnote 1,	(II.)
Advocate. *See* Paraclete.	
Allegory—	
Pl. II. § 73, *d*,	(I.)
Angels—	
Gosp. § 17, *b*,	(I.)
§ 19, *d*, footnote 6,	(I.)
Pet. § 50, *a*, footnote 2,	(I.)
Pl. I. § 64, *a*,	(I.)
III. § 104, *a*,	(II.)
Heb. § 120, *b*,	(II.)
Jude, § 127, *d*, footnote 9,	(II.)
Rev. § 133, *b*,	(II.)
Gosp. II. § 138, *d*,	(II.)
John, § 153 *d*, footnote 9,	(II.)
Antichrist—	
Pl. I. § 63, *c*,	(I.)
Rev. § 131, *a*–*c*,	(II.)
John, § 157, *b*,	(II.)
Apocatastasis—	
Pl. II. § 99, *c*, footnote 6,	(II.)
(John, § 156, *d*, footnote 7),	(II.)
Apostasy—	
Heb. § 125, *d*,	(II.)
John, § 151, *c*,	(II.)
See Sin.	
Apostle—	
Gosp. § 31, *a*,	(I.)
Acts, § 41, *d*,	(I.)
§ 42, *a*,	(I.)
Pet. § 47, *a*, footnote 1,	(I.)
Pl. I. § 61, *b*,	(I.)
II. § 89,	(II.)
III. § 101, *d*,	(II.)
§ 106, *a*,	(II.)
IV. § 108, *a*,	(II.)
John, § 154, *b*,	(II.)
Apostolic decree—	
Acts, § 43, *c*, *d*,	(I.)
Ascension to heaven, Jesus'—	
Gosp. § 19, *c*, footnote 5,	(I.)
Acts, § 39, *b*, footnote 2,	(I.)
Pet. § 50, *a*,	(I.)
Pl. II. § 78, *a*, footnote 2,	(I.)
Heb. § 120, *a*,	(II.)
Gosp. II. § 138, *b*, footnote 5,	(II.)
John, § 144, *b*, footnote 4,	(II.)
§ 154, *c*,	(II.)
Atonement. *See* Propitiation.	
BAPTISM—	
Gosp. § 21, *b*,	(I.)
Acts, § 41, *a*,	(I.)
Pet. § 44, *b*,	(I.)
Pl. I. § 61, *c*,	(I.)
II. § 84,	(I.)
III. § 101, *a*,	(II.)
IV. § 108, *c*,	(II.)
Heb. § 124, *b*,	(II.)
Gosp. II. § 139, *d*, footnote 8,	(II.)
(John, § 155, *a*),	(II.)
§ 156, *a*, footnote 3,	(II.)
Bearing sin—	
Pet. § 49, *b*,	(I.)

Bearing sin—*continued.* VOL.
Heb. § 122, *c*, ... (II.)
John, § 148, *b*, ... (II.)
Believer's priesthood. *See* Priesthood.
Birth, New—
Of God. *See* Creation, New.
Pet. § 46, *a*, ... (I.)
Jas. § 52, *b*, ... (I.)
Pl. II. § 84, *d*, ... (I.)
III. § 101, *a*, ... (II.)
§ 104, *c*, ... (II.)
IV. § 108, *c* (footnote 7), . (II.)
Pet. II. § 128, *a*, ... (II.)
John, § 150, *c*, ... (II.)
Bishops (πρεσβύτεροι, ἐπίσκοποι)—
Acts, § 41, *c*, ... (I.)
Pet. § 47, *a*, footnote 1, . (I.)
Pl. I. § 62, *b*, footnote 2, . (I.)
II. § 92, *d*, . . . (II.)
III. § 106, *a*, footnote 4, . (II.)
IV. § 109, *c*, *d*, . . . (II.)
(Rev. § 133, *a*), . . . (II.)
John, § 156, *a*, footnote 2, . (II.)
Blessedness (σωτηρία). *See* Salvation—
Comp. Rev. § 132, *d*, . . (II.)
Blood (relationship)—
Gosp. § 27, *d*, . . . (I.)
Pl. II. § 67, *d*, . . . (I.)
Heb. § 119, *a*, . . . (II.)
Blood of Christ—
Gosp. § 22, *c*, . . . (I.)
Pet. § 49, *c*, *d*, . . . (I.)
Pl. II. § 80, *c* (footnote 9), . (I.)
§ 85, *b*, *c*, . . . (I.)
III. § 100, *c*, . . . (II.)
Heb. § 121, *c*, . . . (II.)
Rev. § 134, *a*, . . . (II.)
John, § 148, *b*, *c*, . . . (II.)
Body of Christ—
Pl. II. § 85, *c*, . . . (I.)
§ 92, *a*, ... (II.)
III. § 105, *a*, . . . (II.)
Brotherly kiss. *See* Kiss.
Brotherly love. *See* Love.
Burial of Jesus—
Pl. § 78, *a*, footnote 2, . . (I.)

CALLING on Jesus. *See* Invocation.
Calling. *See* Heathenism.
Gosp. § 28, ... (I.)
Pet. § 45, *b–d*, . . . (I.)
Pl. I. § 61, *b*, footnote 4, . (I.)
II. § 88, *a*, *d*, . . . (II.)
III. § 101, *d*, . . . (II.)
IV. § 109, *a*, . . . (II.)
Heb. § 117, *b*, footnote 1, . (II.)
Pet. II. § 127, *a*, . . . (II.)
§ 128, *b*, footnote 3, . . (II.)
Rev. § 135, *c*, footnote 7, . (II.)
Calling of the Gentiles— VOL.
Gosp. § 28, *d*, . . . (I.)
Pl. II. § 90, ... (II.)
III. § 105, *b*, . . . (II.)
Heb. § 117, *b*, footnote 2, . (II.)
Gosp. II. § 136, *d*, . . (II.)
§ 137, *a*, ... (II.)
Christians, Gentile. *See* Gentile Christians.
Christians, Jewish. *See* Judaism.
Church (ἐκκλησία)—
Gosp. § 31, ... (I.)
Acts, § 41, ... (I.)
Pl. I. § 61, *c*, . . . (I.)
II. § 92, *a*, *b*, . . . (II.)
III. § 105, *a*, . . . (II.)
§ 106, *a*, . . . (II.)
IV. § 109, *b*, . . . (II.)
Gosp. II. § 139, *c*, footnote 5, (II.)
(John, § 156, *a*), . . . (II.)
Cleansing. *See* Purification.
Comforter. *See* Paraclete.
Coming of Christ, The second. *See* Parousia.
Commandments. *See* Law.
Conception (supernatural) of Jesus—
Pl. II. § 78, *b*, . . . (I.)
Gosp. II. § 138, *b*, . . (II.)
(John, § 145, *c*, footnote 14), (II.)
Confession—
Pl. II. § 76, *a*, . . . (I.)
§ 82, *d*, ... (I.)
III. § 100, *c*, . . . (II.)
IV. § 110, *c*, . . . (II.)
Heb. § 118, *a*, . . . (II.)
§ 124, *b*, ... (II.)
John, § 149, *a*, . . . (II.)
Conqueror—
Rev. § 134, *a*, footnote 3, . (II.)
§ 135, *b*, ... (II.)
John, § 153, *d*, . . . (II.)
Conscience—
Pet. § 44, *b*, ... (I.)
§ 46, *b*, ... (I.)
Pl. II. § 69, *a*, . . . (I.)
§ 86, *b*, footnote 5, . . (I.)
§ 93, *c*, *d*, . . . (II.)
IV. § 107, *c*, . . . (II.)
Heb. § 115, *b*, footnote 5, . (II.)
§ 123, *a*, ... (II.)
Consummation. *See* Perfection.
Corner-stone, Christ the—
Gosp. § 38, *c*, . . . (I.)
Pet. § 50, *a*, ... (I.)
Pl. II. § 92, *b*, . . . (II.)
(Comp. III. § 106, *a*, . (II.)
IV. § 109, *b*), . . . (II.)
Covenant, Old and New—
Gosp. § 22, *c*, . . . (I.)
Pet. § 49, *c*, ... (I.)
Pl. II. § 80, *c*, footnote 10, . (I.)

Covenant—*continued.* VOL.
III. § 100, *b*, . . . (II.)
Heb. § 115, *a*, . . . (II.)
§ 122, *a*, ... (II.)
(John, § 148, *b*, footnote 4), . (II.)

DAEMONS—
Gosp. § 23, *b*, . . . (I.)
Jas. § 55, *b*, footnote 2, . . (I.)
Pl. II. § 70, *c*, . . . (I.)
III. § 104, *b*, . . . (II.)
Rev. § 133, *c*, . . . (II.)
Gosp. II. § 136, *a*, footnote 2, (II.)
§ 138, *d*, footnote 14, . (II.)
John, § 153, *d*, footnote 9, . (II.)
Day of the Lord. *See* Parousia.
Day of the Lord, The—
Gosp. § 33, *c*, . . . (I.)
Acts, § 40, *d*, . . . (I.)
Pl. I. § 64, *b*, . . . (I.)
II. § 98, *b*, . . . (II.)
III. § 101, *c*, . . . (II.)
Heb. § 126, *b*, . . . (II.)
Pet. II. § 129, *a*, . . . (II.)
Rev. § 131, *d*, . . . (II.)
Deacons—
Acts, § 41, *c*, . . . (I.)
Pet. § 47, *a*, footnote 1, . (I.)
Pl. II. § 92, *d*, . . . (II.)
III. § 106, *a*, . . . (II.)
IV. § 109, *d*, . . . (II.)
Death—
Gosp. § 34, *c*, . . . (I.)
Pet. § 49, *b*, ... (I.)
§ 50, *d*, ... (I.)
Jas. § 57, *d*, ... (I.)
Pl. II. § 66, *d*, . . . (I.)
§ 67, *c*, ... (I.)
§ 96, *d*, ... (II.)
§ 99, *b*, ... (II.)
(Comp. § 72, *b*, . . . (I.)
III. § 104, *c*, footnote 9), . (II.)
Heb. § 122, *d*, . . . (II.)
§ 126, *b*, ... (II.)
Rev. § 132, *b*, . . . (II.)
John, § 148, *a*, footnote 1, . (II.)
§ 157, *c*, ... (II.)
Death of Jesus, The—
Gosp. § 22, *c*, . . . (I.)
Acts, § 38, *c*, *d*, . . . (I.)
Pet. § 48, ... (I.)
Pl. II. § 80, ... (I.)
(Comp. § 87, *a*), . . (I.)
III. § 100, *c*, . . . (II.)
§ 104, *b*, . . . (II.)
§ 105, *c*, . . . (II.)
IV. § 108, *b*, . . . (II.)
Heb. § 122, ... (II.)
Rev. § 134, *a*, . . . (II.)
John, § 148, *b*, *c*, . . . (II.)
Decree, Apostolic. *See* Apostle.
Descent to Hell. *See* Hell.

Destruction— VOL.
Gosp. § 34, *c*, footnote 5, . (I.)
Acts, § 40, *d*, . . . (I.)
Jas. § 57, *d*, ... (I.)
Pl. I. § 64, *b*, . . . (I.)
II. § 66, *d*, . . . (I.)
§ 99, *b*, ... (II.)
III. § 101, *c*, . . . (II.)
IV. § 108, *a*, . . . (II.)
Heb. § 126, *b*, . . . (II.)
Pet. § 129, *a*, *b*, . . . (II.)
Rev. § 132, *b*, . . . (II.)
John, § 148, *a*, . . . (II.)
Discipleship—
Gosp. § 29, *a*, . . . (I.)
Acts, § 41, *b*, . . . (I.)
Gosp. II. § 139, *c*, footnote 5, (II.)
John, § 149, *b*, . . . (II.)
§ 154, *b*, ... (II.)
Disposition—
Gosp. § 26, *c*, *d*, . . . (I.)
Pet. § 47, *a*, . . . (I.)
Jas. § 55, *b*, ... (I.)
Heb. § 124, *c*, footnote 9, . (II.)
John, § 151, *a*, *b*, . . . (II.)
Doctrine—
Pl. II. § 62, *c*, . . . (I.)
III. § 106, *a*, footnote 4, . (II.)
IV. § 107, ... (II.)
Doctrines, False—
Pl. IV. § 107, *b*, *d*, . . (II.)
Pet. II. § 128, *d*, footnote 8, (II.)
John, § 156, *c*, . . . (II.)
§ 157, *b*, ... (II.)
Doing good—
Pet. § 45, *c*, footnote 4, . (I.)
Pl. II. § 65, *b*, footnote 4, . (I.)
John, § 152, *d*, . . . (II.)
§ 157, *c*, ... (II.)
Doxologies—
Pl. IV. § 110, *d*, . . . (II.)
Rev. § 133, *a*, . . . (II.)
Doxologies to Christ. *See* Godhead of Christ.

EDIFICATION—
Pl. II. § 86, *d*, . . . (I.)
§ 92, *b*, ... (II.)
III. § 106, *a*, . . . (II.)
Gosp. II. § 139, *c*, . . (II.)
Elders. *See* Bishops.
Election—
Gosp. § 30, *d*, . . . (I.)
Pet. § 44, *a*, *b*, . . . (I.)
Jas. § 54, *a*, *b*, . . . (I.)
Pl. I. § 61, *b*, *c*, . . . (I.)
II. § 88, ... (II.)
III. § 101, *d*, . . . (II.)
§ 103, *a*, . . . (II.)
IV. § 109, *a*, . . . (II.)
Pet. II. § 128, *b*, footnote 3, . (II.)
Rev. § 135, *c* (footnote 7), . (II.)

Election—*continued.* VOL.
Gosp. II. § 139, *c*, . . (II.)
John, § 152, *d*, . . . (II.)
§ 154, *b*, ... (II.)
End, The. *See* Parousia.
Pet. § 51, *b*, ... (I.)
Pl. II. § 98, *a*, . . . (II.)
§ 99, *b*, footnote 3, . . (II.)
Enemies, Love of. *See* Love.
Exaltation of Christ (to God's right hand)—
Gosp. § 19, *c*, . . . (I.)
Acts, § 39, *b*, *c*, . . . (I.)
Pet. § 50, *a*, ... (I.)
Pl. III. § 103, *d*, . . . (II.)
Heb. § 118, *a*, . . . (II.)
§ 120, *d*, ... (II.)
Rev. § 134, *b*, . . . (II.)
John, § 145, *a*, . . . (II.)
§ 148, *d*, footnote 8, . . (II.)
Example, Jesus as our—
Gosp. § 21, *d*, . . . (I.)
Pet. § 46, *c*, ... (I.)
Pl. I. § 62, *b*, . . . (I.)
II. § 78, *b*, . . . (I.)
(§ 86, *c*, ... (I.)
§ 87, *c*), . . . (I.)
III. § 101, *b*, . . . (II.)
IV. § 110, *c*, footnote 4, . (II.)
Heb. § 119, *b*, footnote 5, . (II.)
Rev. § 135, *b*, . . . (II.)
John, § 147, *b*, *c*, . . . (II.)

Faith—
Gosp. § 29, *b*, *c*, . . . (I.)
Acts, § 40, *c*, . . . (I.)
Pet. § 44, *a*, footnote 2, . (I.)
Jas. § 52, *c*, ... (I.)
Pl. I. § 61, *c*, ... (I.)
II. § 82, *c*, *d*, . . . (I.)
§ 84, *b*, footnotes 9-11, . (I.)
§ 86, *d*, ... (I.)
§ 88, *d*, ... (II.)
§ 92, *c*, ... (II.)
III. § 100, *c*, . . . (II.)
IV. § 107, *a*, . . . (II.)
§ 108, *b*, ... (II.)
Heb. § 125, *a*, footnote 3, *b*, *c*; footnote 7, . . . (II.)
Pet. II. § 127, *d*, . . . (II.)
Rev. § 135, *b*, . . . (II.)
Gosp. II. § 139, *b*, . . (II.)
John, § 149, *a*, *b*, . . . (II.)
§ 151, *a*, ... (II.)
Fall of man. *See* Adam.
False doctrines. *See* Doctrines.
Father (of God)—
Gosp. § 17, *b*, . . . (I.)
Acts, § 39, *b*, footnote 3, . (I.)
Pet. § 50, *a*, footnote 1, . (I.)
Pl. I. § 61, *a*, . . . (I.)
II. § 77, *c*, . . . (I.)

Father—*continued.* VOL.
III. § 103, *a*, . . . (II.)
IV. § 110, *d*, . . . (II.)
Pet. II. § 127, *c*, footnote 5, . (II.)
John, § 143, ... (II.)
§ 145, *a*, ... (II.)
Father of believers—
Gosp. § 20, *b*, . . . (I.)
Pet. § 45, *d*, ... (I.)
(Jas. § 54, *c*), ... (I.)
Pl. I. § 61, *b*, ... (I.)
II. § 83, *a*, ... (I.)
III. § 100, *d*, footnote 12, . (II.)
(IV. § 108, *a*, footnote 3), . (II.)
(Heb. § 124, *a*, footnotes 4, 5), (II.)
Jude, § 127, *a*, footnote 3, . (II.)
John, § 147, *c*, . . . (II.)
Fear of God—
Pet. § 45, *c*, ... (I.)
Pl. II. § 83, *a*, ... (I.)
(Comp. § 98, *b*, footnote 3), . (II.)
III. § 101, *b*, *c*, . . . (II.)
Rev. § 135, *a*, . . . (II.)
Gosp. II. § 139, *b*, . . (II.)
Fellowship with believers—
John, § 156, *a*, ... (II.)
Fellowship with Christ (God), *unio mystica*—
Pet. § 46, *c*, ... (I.)
Pl. I. § 62, *c*, footnote 4, . (I.)
II. § 84, *b*, *c*, . . . (I.)
§ 86, *c*, ... (I.)
(Comp. § 81, *c*), . . . (I.)
§ 92, *a*, ... (II.)
III. § 101, *a*, *b*, . . . (II.)
§ 104, *d*, . . . (II.)
§ 105, *a*, . . . (II.)
IV. § 108, *c*, footnote 8, . (II.)
Rev. § 135, *b*, footnote 6, *c*, . (II.)
John (§ 143, *c*), . . . (II.)
§ 149, *c*, *d*, . . . (II.)
§ 150, *a*, *b*, . . . (II.)
§ 151, *b*, *c*, . . . (II.)
(Comp. Pl. II. § 96, *d*, . . (II.)
Gosp. II. § 139, *c*), . . (II.)
First-born, Rights of. *See* Primogeniture.
First-fruits—
Jas. § 54, *b*, ... (I.)
Pl. I. § 61, *c*, ... (I.)
Rev. § 130, *c*, ... (II.)
Flesh—
Gosp. § 27, *a*, . . . (I.)
Pl. II. § 67, *d*, . . . (I.)
§ 68, *a*, *b*, . . . (I.)
§ 86, *a*, ... (I.)
III. § 100, *a*, . . . (II.)
Heb. § 115, *c*, footnote 9, . (II.)
§ 124, *a*, footnote 5, . . (II.)
Pet. II. § 128, *d*, footnote 6, . (II.)
Gosp. II. § 139, *c*, footnote 7, (II.)
John, § 145, *c*, footnote 12, . (II.)

	VOL.
Flesh of Christ—	
Pet. § 48, *c*,	(I.)
Pl. II. § 78, *c*,	(I.)
III. § 103, *c*,	(II.)
IV. § 110, *c*,	(II.)
Heb. § 119, *a*, footnote 4,	(II.)
§ 123, *d*, footnote 8,	(II.)
John, § 145, *c*,	(II.)
Flock of God (office of Shepherd)—	
Pet. § 45, *a*,	(I.)
§ 47, *a*, footnote 1,	(I.)
Pl. III. § 106, *a*, footnote 4,	(II.)
Heb. § 124, *a*, footnote 1,	(II.)
John, § 152, *d*,	(II.)
§ 156, *a*,	(II.)
Foreknowledge (of God)—	
Pet. § 44, *a*,	(I.)
Pl. II. § 88, *c*,	(II.)
IV. § 109, *a*, footnote 2, *b*,	(II.)
Forgiveness of sins—	
Gosp. § 22, *a*, *b*,	(I.)
Acts, § 40, *a*,	(I.)
Pet. § 44, *b*,	(I.)
Jas. § 54, *d*,	(I.)
Pl. II. § 82, *a*,	(I.)
III. § 100, *d*,	(II.)
Heb. § 122, *b*,	(II.)
Gosp. II. § 139, *a*,	(II.)
John, § 148, *b*,	(II.)
§ 154, *d*,	(II.)
Freedom (true and false) —	
Pet. § 47, *b*,	(I.)
§ 49, *d*,	(I.)
Jas. § 52, *b*,	(I.)
Pl. II. § 87, *a*, *b*,	(I.)
Pet. II. § 128, *d*,	(II.)
Rev. § 135, *a*, footnote 4,	(II.)
Gosp. § 136, *c*, footnote 6,	(II.)
John, § 147, *b*,	(II.)
Fulness (πλήρωμα)—	
Fulness of Godhead—	
Pl. III. § 103, *d*,	(II.)
Fulness of the Gentiles—	
Pl. II. § 91, *d*,	(II.)
Fulness of the times—	
Gosp. § 13, *a*,	(I.)
Pl. II. § 75, *a*,	(I.)
III. § 100, *c*,	(II.)
GARMENTS—	
Rev. § 135, *a*, footnote 2,	(II.)
Gentiles. *See* Heathenism.	
Fulness of the Gentiles. *See* Fulness.	
Gentile Christians (their relation to the Church)—	
Acts, § 43,	(I.)
Pet. § 44, *d*,	(I.)
Pl. II. § 87, *b*,	(I.)
§ 90, *c*, *d*,	(II.)
III. § 105, *b*, *c*,	(II.)
Gentile Christians—*continued*.	VOL.
Heb. § 117, *b*,	(II.)
Rev. § 130, *c*, footnote 5,	(II.)
§ 135, *a*, footnote 4,	(II.)
Gifts of grace. *See* Grace.	
Glory of God (δόξα) and Christ—	
Gosp. § 19, *d*,	(I.)
Pet. § 50, *a*,	(I.)
Jas. § 52, *c*,	(I.)
Pl. I. § 64, *a*,	(I.)
II. § 76, *d*,	(I.)
(Comp. § 77, *d*),	(I.)
§ 98, *a*,	(II.)
III. § 103, *c*, *d* (comp. footnote 4),	(II.)
IV. § 110, *b*, *c*,	(II.)
Heb. § 118, *c*, footnote 7,	(II.)
§ 124, *a*,	(II.)
Rev. § 132, *d*,	(II.)
§ 133, *a*,	(II.)
John § 145, *a*,	(II.)
Glory of believers—	
Pet. § 50, *c*, footnote 5,	(I.)
Pl. I. § 64, *d*,	(I.)
II. § 97, *b*, *c*,	(II.)
III. § 101, *c*,	(II.)
§ 104, *d*,	(II.)
IV. § 108, *a*,	(II.)
Heb. § 118, *c*, footnote 6,	(II.)
Rev. § 132, *d*,	(II.)
God. *See* Grace, Worship, Glory, Goodness.	
Godhead of Christ—	
Gosp. § 19, *a*, footnote 2, *d*,	(I.)
Acts, § 39, *c*,	(I.)
Pet. § 50, *a*,	(I.)
Jas. § 52, *c*,	(I.)
Pl. I. § 61, *a*,	(I.)
II. § 76, *b*,	(I.)
III. § 103, *d*,	(II.)
IV. § 110, *b*,	(II.)
Heb. § 118, *a–c*,	(II.)
Pet. II. § 127, *c*,	(II.)
Rev. § 134, *c*,	(II.)
Gosp. II. § 138, *a*,	(II.)
John, § 145, *a*, *b*,	(II.)
Good-doing—	
Pet. § 45, *c*, footnote 4,	(I.)
Pl. II. § 65, *b*, footnote 4,	(I.)
John, § 152, *d*,	(II.)
§ 157, *c*,	(II.)
Goodness of God—	
Gosp. § 20, *b*,	(I.)
Pl. II. § 75, *c*,	(I.)
III. § 100, *c*, footnote 6,	(II.)
IV. § 108, *b*, footnote 4,	(II.)
Gospel—	
Gosp. § 13, *a*,	(I.)
Pet. § 46, *a*,	(I.)
Pl. I. § 61, *b*,	(I.)
II. § 89, *a*,	(II.)
III. § 101, *d*,	(II.)

Gospel—*continued.* VOL.
IV. § 107, *a*, . . . (II.)
Gosp. II. § 139, *b*, footnote 3, (II.)
Grace—
Acts, § 40, *d*, . . . (I.)
Pet. § 45, *b*, ... (I.)
Jas. § 54, *c*, ... (I.)
Pl. I. § 61, *d*, . . . (I.)
II. § 75, ... (I.)
III. § 100, *a*, . . . (II.)
IV. § 108, *b*, . . . (II.)
Heb. § 124, *a* (footnotes 2, 3), (II.)
Pet. II. § 127, *a*, footnote 2, (II.)
Rev. § 135, *c*, . . . (II.)
Gosp. II. § 139, *c*, . . (II.)
John, § 152, *c*, footnote 9, . (II.)
Grace, Gifts of—
Acts, § 41, *d*, . . . (I.)
Pet. § 45, *b*, ... (I.)
Pl. I. § 62, *d*, . . . (I.)
II. § 92, *b*, . . . (II.)
III. § 106, *a*, . . . (II.)
Heb. § 124, *b*, . . . (II.)
Gosp. II. § 139, *c*, *d*, . . (II.)
Grace, Working of God's (Christ's)—
Gosp. § 29, *d*, . . . (I.)
§ 30, *b*, ... (I.)
Acts, § 40, *b*, . . . (I.)
Pet. § 46, *a*, ... (I.)
Jas. § 52, ... (I.)
Pl. I. § 61, *b*, . . . (I.)
§ 62, *c*, ... (I.)
II. § 86, *d*, . . . (I.)
§ 88, *d*, ... (II.)
§ 89, *a*, ... (II.)
III. § 101, *b*, *d*, . . (II.)
IV. § 108, *c*, . . . (II.)
Heb. § 124, *c*, . . . (II.)
Pet. § 128, *a*, *b*, . . . (II.)
Rev. § 135, *c*, . . . (II.)
Gosp. II. § 139, *c*, . . . (II.)
Growth—
Gosp. § 30, *b*, . . . (I.)
Pet. § 46, *b*, ... (I.)
Pl. I. § 62, *b*, . . . (I.)
III. § 106, *c*, footnote 9, . (II.)
§ 135, *a*, footnote 3, . (II.)

HADES—
Gosp. § 34, *c*, footnote 6, . (I.)
Pet. § 48, *d*, ... (I.)
Pl. II. § 99, *b*, footnote 4, . (II.)
(Comp. § 96, *d*, footnote 4), . (II.)
Hands, Imposition of—
Acts, § 41, *d*, . . . (I.)
Pl. IV. § 109, *d*, footnote 11, (II.)
Heb. § 124, *b*, . . . (II.)
Hardening—
Gosp. § 29, *d*, . . . (I.)
Pl. II. § 88, *b*, . . . (II.)
§ 91, *c*, ... (II.)

Hardening—*continued.* VOL.
Heb. § 125, *d*, footnote 11, . (II.)
John, § 153, *c*, . . . (II.)
Heart. *See* Disposition—
Gosp. § 27, *d*, . . . (I.)
Pl. II. § 68, *d* (footnotes 12, 13), (I.)
Heathenism—
Pl. II. § 69, ... (I.)
§ 70, ... (I.)
III. § 100, *b*, . . . (II.)
IV. § 108, *a*, . . . (II.)
Rev. § 130, *c*, . . . (II.)
§ 132, *c*, footnote 5, . . (II.)
John, § 152, *d*, . . . (II.)
Heathens, Calling of. *See* Calling of Gentiles.
Heathen, Missions to the—
Gosp. § 31, *a*, . . . (I.)
Acts, § 43, *a*, *b*, . . . (I.)
Pl. II. § 89, *d*, . . . (II.)
III. § 101, *d*, . . . (II.)
IV. § 108, *a*, . . . (II.)
Rev. § 130, *c*, footnote 5, . (II.)
Gosp. II. § 136, *d*, . . (II.)
§ 137, *a*, *c*, . . . (II.)
John, § 154, *b*, . . . (II.)
§ 156, *d*, ... (II.)
Heaven—
Pl. III. § 103, *d*, footnote 7, (II.)
Heb. § 120, *a*, footnote 1, . (II.)
Heaven, Kingdom of. *See* Kingdom of God—
Gosp. II. § 138, *c*, footnote 9, (II.)
Hell—
Gosp. § 34, *d*, . . . (I.)
Jas. § 55, *b*, footnote 2, . (I.)
Gosp. II. § 138, *c*, footnote 10, (II.)
Rev. § 132, *b*, . . . (II.)
Hell, Descent to, by Christ—
Pet. § 48, *d*, ... (I.)
§ 50, *d*, ... (I.)
Comp. Pl. III. § 103, *c*, footnote 3, . . . (II.)
Heb. § 117, *c*, footnote 4, . (II.)
Holiest, The (earthly and heavenly)—
Heb. § 120, *a*, . . . (II.)
Holiness of God, The—
Pet. § 45, *d*, footnote 6, . (I.)
Pl. II. § 84, *d*, . . . (I.)
Pet. II. § 128, *a*, . . . (II.)
Rev. § 133, *a*, footnote 1, . (II.)
John, § 147, *b*, . . . (II.)
Holiness, The idea of—
Pl. II. § 84, *d*, footnote 14, . (I.)
IV. § 109, *a*, . . . (II.)
Pet. II. § 127, *d*, footnote 9, . (II.)
Rev. § 135, *a*, footnote 2, . (II.)
Gosp. II. § 138, *d*, . . (II.)
Holiness of Christians—
Pet. § 44, *b*, ... (I.)
§ 45, *c*, ... (I.)

Holiness of Christians—*continued.* VOL.
Pl. I. § 61, *c*, footnote 5, . (I.)
II. § 84, *a*, . . . (I.)
§ 92, *a*, ... (II.)
III. § 101, *a*, . . . (II.)
(Comp. § 106, *a*), . . . (II.)
IV. § 108, *c*, footnote 9, . (II.)
Heb. § 123, *b*, . . . (II.)
Rev. § 132, *d*, . . . (II.)
§ 135, *a*, ... (II.)
Gosp. II. § 139, *c*, footnote 5, (II.)
(Comp. § 136, *d*, footnote 7), (II.)
§ 154, *b*, . . . (II.)
Holy One, The (κατ' ἐξοχήν) Christ—
Gosp. § 17, *b*, footnote 2, . (I.)
§ 18, *a*, footnote 1, . . (I.)
Acts, § 38, *b*, . . . (I.)
Rev. § 134, *b*, . . . (II.)
(Comp. § 133, *a*), . . . (II.)
Gosp. II. § 137, *a* (footnote 2), (II.)
John, § 152, *b*, . . . (II.)
(Comp. § 147, *b*), . . . (II.)
Hope—
Pet. § 50, *b*, ... (I.)
§ 51, ... (I.)
Pl. I. § 62, *b*, . . . (I.)
II. § 96, *a*, . . . (II.)
III. § 101, *c*, . . . (II.)
IV. § 108, *a*, . . . (II.)
Heb. § 125, *a*, footnote 2, . (II.)
Pet. II. § 127, *b*, . . . (II.)
John, § 157, *d*, . . . (II.)
House of God (*familia*)—
Pl. IV. § 109, *b*, footnote 3, . (II.)
Heb. § 117, *b*, . . . (II.)
§ 124, *a*, ... (II.)
Humility—
Gosp. § 25, *d*, . . . (I.)
Pet. § 47, a, ... (I.)
Jas. § 55, b, ... (I.)
Pl. II. § 93, a, . . . (II.)
III. § 106, b, . . . (II.)

Image of God—
Pl. III. § 104, *c*, . . . (II.)
Image of God (Christ)—
Pl. II. § 76, *d*, . . . (I.)
III. § 103, *d*, . . . (II.)
Heb. § 118, *c*, footnote 7, . (II.)
Imposition of Hands. *See* Hands.
Incarnation. *See* Kenosis.
Indifferent Things. *See* Adiaphora.
Infirmity, Sins of. *See* Sins.
Inheritance (κληρονομία)—
Gosp. § 34, *a*, . . . (I.)
Pet. § 50, *c*, ... (I.)
Pl. II. § 72, *d*, . . . (I.)
§ 77, *d*, ... (II.)
§ 97, *c*, *d*, . . . (II.)
III. § 101, *c*, . . . (II.)
IV. § 108, *a*, . . . (II.)

Inheritance—*continued.* VOL.
Heb. § 126, *a*, footnote 1, . (II.)
Rev. § 132, *d*, footnote 7, . (II.)
Gosp. II. § 139, *c*, . . (II.)
Inspiration—
Pet. § 46, *a*, ... (I.)
(Comp. § 44, *b*), . . . (I.)
Pl. I. § 61, *b*, . . . (I.)
II. § 89, *a*, *b*, . . . (II.)
III. § 101, *d*, . . . (II.)
Heb. § 116, *c*, footnote 4, . (II.)
John, § 155, *d*, footnote 7, . (II.)
Intercession (*Intercessio*), Christ's—
Heb. § 119, *d*, . . . (II.)
John, § 148, *b*, . . . (II.)
Invocation of Jesus. *See* Godhead, Christ's.

Jerusalem, Heavenly—
Pl. II. § 90, *c*, . . . (II.)
Heb. § 117, *d*, . . . (II.)
§ 126, *d*, ... (II.)
Rev. § 132, *c*, *d*, . . . (II.)
(Gosp. II. § 136, *d*, footnote 7), (II.)
Jewish Christians (relation to the Law)—
Acts, § 42, *c*, . . . (I.)
§ 43, *d*, ... (I.)
Pl. II. § 87, *b*, . . . (I.)
III. § 105, *d*, . . . (II.)
Joys—
Pl. I. § 62, *b*, . . . (I.)
II. § 83, *b*, . . . (I.)
John, § 144, *d*, . . . (II.)
§ 154, *c*, ... (II.)
Judaism—
Gosp. § 15, *b*, . . . (I.)
§ 28, *d*, ... (I.)
Acts, § 42, ... (I.)
Pet. § 44, *a–c*, . . . (I.)
Pl. I. § 63, *a*, *b*, . . . (I.)
II. § 71, ... (I.)
§ 91, ... (II.)
III. § 100, *b*, . . . (II.)
§ 105, *b*, . . . (II.)
IV. § 108, *a*, footnote 1, . (II.)
Heb. § 117, *a*, *b*, . . . (II.)
Rev. § 130, *c*, *d*, . . . (II.)
Gosp. II. § 136, *d*, . . . (II.)
§ 137, *a*, *c*, . . . (II.)
John, § 152, *d*, . . . (II.)
Just—
Gosp. § 33, *c*, . . . (I.)
Acts, § 40, *d*, . . . (I.)
Pet. § 50, *d*, ... (I.)
Jas. § 57, *c*, ... (I.)
Pl. I. § 61, *a*, . . . (I.)
§ 64, *b*, ... (I.)
II. § 98, *b*, *c*, . . . (II.)
III. § 101, *c*, . . . (II.)
IV. § 110, *b*, . . . (II.)
Heb. § 126, *b*, . . . (II.)

	VOL.
Just—*continued.*	
Pet. II. § 129, *a*,	(II.)
Rev. § 130, *b*,	(II.)
§ 131, *d*,	(II.)
§ 132, *b*,	(II.)
Gosp. II. § 138, *c*,	(II.)
John, § 153, *c*,	(II.)
§ 157, *c*,	(II.)
Justification—	
Jas. § 53, *c*,	(I.)
Pl. § 65, *c*,	(I.)
§ 82, *a*, *b*,	(I.)
III. § 100, *d*,	(II.)
IV. § 108, *b*, *c*, footnote 7,	(II.)
(Heb. § 125, *c*, footnote 6),	(II.)
Rev. § 132, *b*, footnote 3,	(II.)
Gosp. II. § 139, *a*,	(II.)
Kenosis—	
Pl. III. § 103, *c*,	(II.)
Heb. § 119, *a* (footnote 3),	(II.)
John, § 145, *a*, *c*,	(II.)
Kingdom of Christ—	
Heb. § 120, *c*,	(II.)
Pl. II. § 99, *b*,	(II.)
III. § 103, *c*,	(II.)
(Comp. § 104, *b*, footnote 6),	(II.)
IV. § 110, *b*,	(II.)
Heb. § 120, *c*,	(II.)
Pet. II. § 129, *d*,	(II.)
Rev. § 132, *a*,	(II.)
Gosp. II. § 138, *c*,	(II.)
John, § 146, *a*, footnote 1,	(II.)
Kingdom of God—	
Gosp. § 13, *a*, *b*,	(I.)
§ 14, *a*,	(I.)
§ 15,	(I.)
§ 34, *a*,	(I.)
Acts, § 42, *c*, footnote 2,	(I.)
Pet. § 50, *c*,	(I.)
Jas. § 57, *d*,	(I.)
Pl. I. § 64, *d*,	(I.)
II. § 97, *d*,	(II.)
§ 99, *c*,	(II.)
III. § 101, *c*,	(II.)
Heb. § 126, *d*,	(II.)
Rev. § 132, *c*,	(II.)
Gosp. II. § 138, *c*,	(II.)
John, § 146, *a*,	(II.)
(§ 157, *d*),	(II.)
Kiss, Brotherly—	
Pet. § 47, *a*,	(I.)
Comp. Pl. II. § 93, *b*,	(II.)
Knowledge (enlightenment)—	
Pl. III. § 102,	(II.)
IV. § 107, *a*,	(II.)
Heb. § 124, *d*,	(II.)
Pet. II. § 127, *a*,	(II.)
§ 128, *a*,	(II.)
John, § 146, *b*, *c*,	(II.)
§ 147,	(II.)
§ 149, *a*,	(II.)

	VOL.
Lamb (Passover)—	
Acts, § 38, *d*,	(I.)
Pet. § 49, *a*, *d* (footnote 7),	(I.)
Pl. § 80, *c*, footnote 10,	(I.)
Rev. § 134, *a* (footnote 2),	(II.)
John, § 148, *b*,	(II.)
Law—	
Gosp. § 24,	(I.)
Acts, § 42, *c*, *d*,	(I.)
Pet. § 45, *c*, footnote 4,	(I.)
Jas. § 52, *a*, *b*,	(I.)
Pl. I. § 62, *a*,	(I.)
II. § 65, *b*,	(I.)
§ 71, *b*, *c*,	(I.)
§ 72, *a–c*,	(I.)
§ 87,	(I.)
III. § 101, *b*,	(II.)
§ 105, *c*, *d*,	(II.)
IV. § 107, *a*, footnote 3,	(II.)
Heb. § 115, *b–d*,	(II.)
§ 116, *a*, *d*,	(II.)
§ 124, *c*,	(II.)
Pet. II. § 128, *b*,	(II.)
Rev. § 135, *a*,	(II.)
Gosp. II. § 136, *c*,	(II.)
§ 137, *b*,	(II.)
John, § 146, *d*,	(II.)
§ 151, *a*,	(II.)
§ 152, *c*,	(II.)
Libertinism. *See* Freedom.	
Life—	
Gosp. § 34, *b*,	(I.)
Acts, § 40, *d*,	(I.)
Pet. § 50, *c*,	(I.)
Jas. § 57, *d*,	(I.)
Pl. I. § 64, *d*,	(I.)
II. § 65, *d*,	(I.)
§ 96, *c*, *d*,	(II.)
III. § 101, *c*,	(II.)
§ 104, *c*,	(II.)
IV. § 108, *a*,	(II.)
Heb. § 126, *c*,	(II.)
Pet. II. § 128, *a*,	(II.)
Rev. § 132, *d* (footnote 6),	(II.)
§ 135, *a*, footnote 3, *c*,	(II.)
John, § 146,	(II.)
§ 148, *c*, *d*,	(II.)
§ 157, *c*,	(II.)
Life of God—	
Pl. II. § 65, *d*,	(I.)
IV. § 110, *d*,	(II.)
Rev. § 133, *a*,	(II.)
John, § 146, *b*, footnote 4,	(II.)
(Comp. Pet. § 46, *a*),	(I.)
§ 51, *d*,	(I.)
Heb. § 116, *b*,	(II.)
Light—	
Pet. § 45, *b*,	(I.)
Pl. III. § 102, *a*, footnote 1, *d*, footnote 5,	(II.)
§ 104, *d*,	(II.)
IV. § 110, *d*,	(II.)

Light—*continued.* VOL.
John, § 147, ... (II.)
Logos—
Pl. II. § 79, *a*, footnote 4, . (I.)
III. § 103, *d*, footnote 10, . (II.)
Heb. § 118, *c*, *d*, . . . (II.)
(Rev. § 134, *d*, footnote 5), . (II.)
John, § 145, *b*, ... (II.)
Lord (κύριος)—
Gosp. § 18, *d*, ... (I.)
Acts, § 39, *c*, ... (I.)
Pet. § 50, *a*, ... (I.)
Jas. § 52, *c*, footnote 4, . (I.)
Pl. I. § 61, *a*, footnotes 2, 3, . (I.)
II. § 76, *a–c*, . . . (I.)
III. § 100, *c*, ... (II.)
§ 103, *d*, ... (II.)
IV. § 110, *b*, ... (II.)
Heb. § 118, *a*, ... (II.)
Pet. II. § 127, *c*, ... (II.)
Rev. § 134, *b*, ... (II.)
Gosp. II. § 138, *a*, footnote 1, (II.)
John, § 145, *a*, footnote 2, . (II.)
Lord's Supper—
Gosp. § 31, *b*, ... (I.)
Acts, § 41, *b*, ... (I.)
Pl. II. § 85, ... (I.)
(John, § 156, *a*, footnote 3), . (II.)
Love of God—
Pl. II. § 75, *c*, ... (I.)
§ 83, *a*, ... (I.)
§ 88, *a*, ... (II.)
III. § 100, *d*, ... (II.)
§ 101, *d*, ... (II.)
Pet. II. § 127, *a*, footnote 3, . (II.)
John, § 147, *c*, ... (II.)
Love to God—
Gosp. § 25, *b*, footnote 1, . (I.)
§ 26, *d*, footnote 3, . . (I.)
Jas. § 54, *a*, ... (I.)
§ 55, *a*, ... (I.)
Pl. II. § 88, *c*, ... (I.)
John, § 143, *c*, ... (I.)
§ 151, *b*, ... (I.)
Love to our Neighbour (brotherly-love, love to enemies)—
Gosp. § 25, ... (I.)
Acts, § 41, *b*, ... (I.)
Pet. § 47, *a*, *d*, . . . (I.)
Pl. I. § 62, *b*, ... (I.)
II. § 93, *b*, ... (II.)
III. § 106, *c* (footnote 9), . (II.)
IV. § 108, *d*, footnote 10, . (II.)
Heb. § 124, *a* (footnote 4), . (II.)
Pet. II. § 128, *c*, ... (II.)
Rev. § 135, *a*, footnote 3, . (II.)
John, § 151, *a*, ... (II.)
§ 156, *b*, ... (II.)
Lusts—
Pet. § 46, *b*, ... (I.)
Jas. § 56, *a*, ... (I.)
Pl. II. § 66, *c*, ... (I.)

Lusts—*continued.* VOL.
Pl. III. § 100, *a*, ... (II.)
IV. § 108, *a*, footnote 1, . (II.)
Pet. II. § 128, *b*, ... (II.)

Magistracy—
Gosp. § 19, *b*, ... (I.)
Pet. § 47, *b*, ... (I.)
Pl. I. § 63, *d*, ... (I.)
II. § 94, *a*, ... (II.)
IV. § 110, *a*, footnote 2, . (II.)
Man, Son of—
Gosp. § 16, ... (I.)
Rev. § 134, *b*, ... (II.)
John, § 144, *c*, *d*, . . . (II.)
Man and Woman—
Pl. II. § 94, *c*, *d*, . . . (II.)
Marriage—
Gosp. § 26, *b*, ... (I.)
Pet. § 47, *c*, ... (I.)
Pl. II. § 95, ... (II.)
III. § 106, *d*, . . . (II.)
IV. § 109, *c*, footnote 8, . (II.)
Heb. § 124, *c*, . . . (II.)
Meekness—
Gosp. § 25, *c*, ... (I.)
Pet. § 47, *a*, ... (I.)
Jas. § 56, *d*, ... (I.)
Pl. II. § 93, *a*, ... (I.)
III. § 106, *b*, ... (II.)
Mercy—
Gosp. § 25, *c*, ... (I.)
Pet. § 47, *a*, ... (I.)
Jas. § 52, *a*, ... (I.)
Mercy of God—
Pet. § 45, *b*, footnote 3, . (I.)
Jas. § 57, *b*, ... (I.)
Pl. II. § 75, *c*, ... (I.)
§ 90, *b*, ... (II.)
§ 91, *d*, footnote 8, . (II.)
III. § 100, *c*, footnote 6, . (II.)
IV. § 108, *b*, footnote 4, . (II.)
Messiah—
Gosp. § 13, *c*, *d*, ... (I.)
§ 18, *a*, ... (I.)
Acts, § 38, ... (I.)
§ 39, *a*, *b*, ... (I.)
Pet. § 48, *a*, ... (I.)
§ 50, *a*, ... (I.)
Pl. I. § 61, *a*, ... (I.)
II. § 77, *a*, ... (I.)
III. § 105, *b*, . . . (II.)
Heb. § 118, *a*, *b*, . . . (II.)
§ 119, *a*, ... (II.)
§ 120, *c*, *d*, ... (II.)
Rev. § 134, *b*, ... (II.)
Gosp. II. § 136, *a*, *b*, . . (II.)
§ 137, *a*, footnote 2, . (II.)
John, § 143, *a*, ... (II.)
§ 145, *a*, ... (II.)
§ 152, *b*, ... (II.)

Miracles— VOL.
Gosp. § 13, *c*, . . . (I.)
§ 18, *b*, ... (I.)
§ 20, *d*, ... (I.)
Acts, § 38, *b*, . . . (I.)
§ 40, *a*, ... (I.)
Jas. § 54, *d*, footnote 3, . (I.)
Pl. II. § 89, *c* (footnote 10), . (II.)
§ 92, *c*, ... (II.)
Heb. § 124, *b*, . . . (II.)
Gosp. II. § 136, *a*, *b*, footnote 4, ... (II.)
§ 138, *a*, ... (II.)
John, § 143, *b*, *c*, . . . (II.)
§ 144, *c*, footnote 8, . . (II.)
§ 145, *a*, ... (II.)
§ 147, *c*, footnote 7, . . (II.)

Mysteries—
Pl. II. § 75, *a*, . . . (I.)
§ 92, *b*, footnote 8, . . (II.)
III. § 100, *c*, . . . (II.)
§ 102, *b*, *c*, . . . (II.)
IV. § 107, *c*, . . . (II.)

Name of Jesus—
Gosp. § 29, *b*, . . . (I.)
Acts, § 40, *c*, . . . (I.)
§ 41, *a* (footnote 1), . . (I.)
Pet. § 48, *a*, footnote 1, . (I.)
Jas. § 52, *c*, footnote 4, . (I.)
Pl. I. § 61, *a* (footnotes 1, 2), (I.)
II. § 73, *a* (footnotes 1, 2), (I.)
III. § 100, *c*, footnote 8, . (II.)
IV. § 110, *b*, footnote 3, . (II.)
Heb. § 118, *a*, footnote 1, . (II.)
Pet. II. § 127, *c*, footnote 5, . (II.)
Rev. § 134, *a*, footnote 1, . (II.)
(§ 135, *b*), ... (II.)
Gosp. II. § 136, *b*, . . (II.)
§ 138, *a*, footnote 1, . . (II.)
John, § 145, *a*, footnote 1, . (II.)
(§ 149, *a*, footnote 2), . (II.)

Near to God, To draw—
Pet. § 45, *c*, ... (I.)
Pl. III. § 104, *d*, . . . (II.)
Heb. § 123, *d*, . . . (II.)
Gosp. II. § 136, *a*, . . (II.)

Neighbour, Love to. *See* Love.
New Birth. *See* Birth.

Νοῦς—
Pl. II. § 68, *c*, . . . (I.)
§ 86, *b*, ... (I.)
III. § 100, *a*, . . . (II.)
IV. § 108, *a*, footnote 1, . (II.)
Rev. § 135, *d*, footnote 10, . (II.)

Nurture—
Pl. III. § 106, *d*, . . . (II.)

Obedience—
Pet. § 44, *a*, *c*, . . . (I.)
§ 45, *d*, ... (I.)
Pl. II. § 82, *d*, . . . (II.)

Obedience—*continued.* VOL.
Pl. IV. § 100, *d*, footnote 12, (II.)
Heb. § 124, *a*, footnote 5, . (II.)
§ 125, *d*, ... (II.)
Gosp. II. § 139, *b*, . . (II.)

Obedience of Christ—
Pl. II. § 80, *a*, . . . (I.)
§ 81, *a*, ... (I.)
(Comp. § 82, *d*), . . . (I.)
§ 87, *a*, footnote 1, . . (I.)
Heb. § 119, *d*, . . . (II.)

Offering. *See* Sacrifice.

Office. Officers—
Gosp. § 31, *c*, . . . (I.)
Acts, § 41, *c*, . . . (I.)
Pl. II. § 92, *d*, . . . (II.)
III. § 106, *a*, . . . (II.)
IV. § 109, *c*, *d*, . . (II.)
John, § 156, *a*, footnote 2, . (II.)

Paraclete. *See* Spirit, Holy—
John, § 148, *b*, . . . (II.)
§ 155, ... (II.)

Pardon. *See* Absolution—
Gosp. § 22, *a*, *b*, . . . (I.)
Acts, § 40, *a*, . . . (I.)
Pet. § 44, *b*, . . . (I.)
Jas. § 54, *d*, . . . (I.)
Pl. II. § 82, *a*, . . . (I.)
III. § 100, *d*, . . . (II.)
Heb. § 122, *b*, . . . (II.)
Gosp. II. § 139, *a*, . . (II.)
John, § 148, *b*, . . . (II.)
§ 154, *d*, ... (II.)

Parousia of Christ, The—
Gosp. § 19, *d*, . . . (I.)
Acts, § 39, *d*, . . . (I.)
Pet. § 50, *c*, ... (I.)
Jas. § 57, *c*, ... (I.)
Pl. I. § 63, *d*, . . . (I.)
§ 64, *a*, ... (I.)
II. § 98, *a*, . . . (II.)
III. § 101, *c*, . . . (II.)
IV. § 110, *b*, . . . (II.)
Heb. § 126, *c*, . . . (II.)
Pet. II. § 129, *c*, . . (II.)
Rev. § 130, *a*, . . . (II.)
§ 131, *d*, ... (II.)
Gosp. II. § 138, *c*, . . (II.)
John, § 157, *a*, . . . (II.)

Parousia, Signs of the—
Gosp. § 33, *b*, . . . (I.)
Pet. § 51, *b*, . . . (I.)
Pl. I. § 63, ... (I.)
II. § 98, *a*, . . . (II.)
IV. § 110, *a*, . . . (II.)
Pet. II. § 129, *c*, . . (II.)
Rev. § 130, *b*–*d*, . . . (II.)
Gosp. II. § 138, *c*, . . (II.)
John, § 157, *b*, . . . (II.)

Parousia, The time of—
Gosp. § 33, *a*, . . . (I.)

Paronsia, The time of—*continued.* VOL.
Pet. § 51, *b*, (I.)
Pl. I. § 63, *d*, (I.)
II. § 98, *a*, (II.)
Heb. § 126, *c*, footnote 4, (II.)
Pet. II. § 129, *c*, (II.)
Rev. § 130, *a*, (II.)
§ 131, (II.)
Gosp. II. § 138, *c*, (II.)
John, § 157, *b*, (II.)
Passover. *See* Lamb.
Patience—
Gosp. § 30, *a*, (I.)
Pet. § 46, *d*, (I.)
Jas. § 55, *c*, (I.)
Pl. I. § 62, *b*, (I.)
II. § 86, *c*, (I.)
III. § 101, *b*, footnote 5, (II.)
IV. § 110, *a*, (II.)
Heb. § 125, *c*, (II.)
Pet. II. § 128, *c*, (II.)
Rev. § 135, *b*, (II.)
Peace (εἰρήνη)—
Pl. II. § 80, *d*, (I.)
§ 83, *b*, (I.)
III. § 100, *d*, (II.)
§ 105, *c*, (II.)
§ 106, *a*, (II.)
Heb. § 124, *c*, footnote 10, (II.)
Pet. II. § 127, *a*, footnote 3, (II.)
Rev. § 135, *c*, (II.)
People of God—
Pet. § 45, *a*, (I.)
Jas. § 54, *b*, (I.)
Pl. II. § 71, *a*, (I.)
(Comp. IV. § 109, *b*, footnote 3), (II.)
Heb. § 124, *a*, (II.)
Pet. II. § 128, *d*, footnote 8, (II.)
Rev. § 130, *c*, (II.)
§ 132, *c*, (II.)
Perfection (τελείωσις)—
Heb. § 115, *c*, (II.)
§ 119, *b*, footnote 6, (II.)
§ 123, *c*, (II.)
Piety (εὐσέβεια)—
Pl. IV. § 107, *c*, (II.)
Pet. II. § 128, *c*, (II.)
Pilgrimage—
Pet. § 51, *a*, footnote 1, (I.)
Heb. § 126, *d*, (II.)
Pet. II. § 129, *d*, (II.)
Prayer—
Gosp. § 20, *b*, (I.)
§ 30, *b*, (I.)
Acts, § 41, *b*, (I.)
Pet. § 46, *a*, (I.)
Jas. § 55, *d*, (I.)
Pl. I. § 62, *c*, (I.)
II. § 86, *d*, (I.)
III. § 101, *b*, footnote 5, (II.)
§ 106, *c*, (II.)
Rev. § 130, *c*, (II.)

Prayer—*continued.* VOL.
Rev. § 135, *a*, (II.)
Gosp. § 139, *c*, footnote 6, (II.)
John, § 154, *d*, (II.)
Prayer in the name of Jesus—
John, § 154, *d*, (II.)
Predestination. *See* Election.
Pre-existence of Christ—
Pet. § 48, *a*, *b*, (I.)
Pl. II. § 79, (I.)
III. § 103, *a*, *b*, (II.)
IV. § 110, *c*, (II.)
Heb. § 118, *b*–*d*, (II.)
Rev. § 134, *d*, (II.)
John, § 144, *a*, *b*, (II.)
Presbyters. *See* Elders.
Priesthood of Christ—
Heb. § 119, (II.)
§ 120, (II.)
Rev. § 134, *a*, (II.)
John, § 143, *b*, (II.)
Priesthood of believers—
Pet. § 45, *c*, (I.)
Heb. § 123, *d*, footnote 7, (II.)
Rev. § 130, *c*, footnote 4, (II.)
§ 132, *a*, *c*, footnote 4, (II.)
Primogeniture—
Heb. § 124, *a*, (II.)
See Sonship.
Promise—
Pl. II. § 72, *d*, (I.)
III. § 100, *b*, (II.)
§ 105, *b*, (II.)
IV. § 108, *a*, (II.)
Heb. § 115, *a*, (II.)
§ 116, *a*, (II.)
§ 126, *a*, (II.)
Pet. II. § 127, *b*, (II.)
John, § 152, *b*, (II.)
Prophecy—
Gosp. § 13, (I.)
§ 15, (I.)
§ 19, *a*, *b*, (I.)
Acts, § 38, (I.)
§ 39, *a*, *b*, (I.)
Pet. § 46, *a* (footnote 1), (I.)
§ 48, *a*, (I.)
Pl. II. § 73, (I.)
III. § 101, *c*, (II.)
Heb. § 116, *a*, (II.)
§ 118, *b*, footnote 5, *c*, (II.)
Pet. II. § 127, *b*, (II.)
Rev. § 135, *d*, (II.)
John, § 155, *c*, (II.)
Prophecy of Jesus—
Gosp. § 18, *c*, (I.)
§ 19, *c*, *d*, (I.)
§ 33, (I.)
Gosp. II. § 136, *a*, footnote 3, (II.)
John, § 145, *a*, footnote 4, (II.)
Prophets—
Pl. II. § 92, *b*, (II.)

Prophets—*continued.* VOL.
Pl. III. § 106, *a*, . . . (II.)
IV. § 108, *c*, . . . (II.)
§ 109, *d*, footnote 11, . (II.)
Pet. II. § 127, *b*, footnote 4, *d*, footnote 9, . . (II.)
Rev. § 135, *d*, . . (II.)
John, § 152, *a*, *b*, . . (II.)
Propitiation—
Pl. II. § 80, *c*, . . . (I.)
Heb. § 122, *b*, . . . (II.)
John, § 148, *b*, . . . (II.)
Punishment—
Gosp. § 32, *d*, . . . (I.)
§ 34, *c*, *d*, . . . (I.)
Jas. § 57, *d*, . . . (I.)
Pl. I. § 61, *a*, . . . (I.)
§ 64, *b*, ... (I.)
II. § 98, *d*, footnote 5, . (II.)
Heb. § 126, *b*, . . . (II.)
Pet. II. § 129, *a*, . . . (II.)
John, § 151, *d*, . . . (II.)
Purification—
Pl. III. § 101, *a*, . . . (II.)
Heb. § 122, *a*, . . . (II.)
§ 123, *a*, ... (II.)
Pet. II. § 127, *c*, . . . (II.)
Rev. § 134, *a*, . . . (II.)
John, § 146, *d*, footnote 7, . (II.)
§ 148, *b*, footnote 3, . . (II.)

QUOTATIONS. *See* Scripture.

RECOMPENSE—
Gosp. § 32, *a–c*, . . . (I.)
Pet. § 51, *d*, . . . (I.)
Pl. II. § 98, *d*, footnote 6, . (II.)
III. § 101, *c*, . . . (II.)
IV. § 108, *d*, . . . (II.)
Heb. § 126, *a*, . . . (II.)
Rev. § 132, *b*, . . . (II.)
John, § 151, *d*, . . . (II.)
Reconciliation—
Pl. II. § 80, *d*, . . . (II.)
III. § 100, *c*, . . . (II.)
§ 104, *a*, *c*, . . . (II.)
Redeemer—
Pl. II. § 72, *b*, footnote 1, . (I.)
IV. § 110, *b*, footnote 3, . (II.)
Heb. § 119, *a*, . . . (II.)
Redemption—
Gosp. § 22, *c*, . . . (I.)
Pet. § 49, *d*, . . . (I.)
Pl. II. § 80, *c*, . . . (I.)
III. § 100, *c*, footnote 9, . (II.)
IV. § 108, *b*, . . . (II.)
Heb. § 122, *c*, . . . (II.)
Pet. II. § 127, *c* (footnote 7), (II.)
Rev. § 134, *a*, . . . (II.)
John, § 148, *c*, . . . (II.)
Regeneration (born of God)—
Pet. § 46, *a*, ... (I.)
Jas. § 52, *b*, ... (I.)

Regeneration—*continued.* VOL.
Pl. II. § 84, *d*, . . . (I.)
III. § 101, *a*, . . . (II.)
§ 104, *c*, . . . (II.)
IV. § 108, *c* (footnote 7), . (II.)
Pet. II. § 128, *a*, . . . (II.)
John, § 150, *c*, . . . (II.)
Repentance (μετάνοια)—
Gosp. § 21, ... (I.)
Acts, § 40, *b*, . . . (I.)
Pl. II. § 86, *d*, footnote 9, . (I.)
IV. § 107, *d*, footnote 7, . (II.)
Heb. § 124, *c*, . . . (II.)
Pet. II. § 129, *c*, . . . (II.)
Rev. § 135, *a*, . . . (II.)
Restitution. *See* Apocatastasis.
Resurrection of Jesus—
Gosp. § 19, *c*, footnote 5, . (I.)
Acts, § 39, *a*, . . . (I.)
Pet. § 48, *c*, ... (I.)
§ 50, *a*, *b*, . . . (I.)
Pl. II. § 78, *a*, . . . (I.)
§ 81, *c*, *d*, . . . (I.)
III. § 101, *c*, . . . (II.)
IV. § 110, *c*, . . . (II.)
Heb. § 118, *a*, . . . (II.)
§ 120, *a*, ... (II.)
Rev. § 134, *b*, footnote 4, . (II.)
Gosp. II. § 136, *a*, . . (II.)
§ 138, *b*, ... (II.)
John, § 154, *c*, . . . (II.)
Resurrection of believers—
Gosp. § 34, *b*, *d*, . . . (I.)
Acts, § 39, *a*, footnote 1, . (I.)
Pet. § 50, *c*, footnote 5, . (I.)
Pl. I. § 64, *c*, . . . (I.)
II. § 97, *a*, *b*, . . . (II.)
§ 99, *a*, *b*, . . . (II.)
III. § 101, *c*, . . . (II.)
IV. § 108, *a*, . . . (II.)
Heb. § 126, *d*, . . . (II.)
Pet. II. § 129, *c*, footnote 2, . (II.)
Rev. § 132, *b*, . . . (II.)
Gosp. II. § 139, *c*, . . (II.)
John, § 148, *a*, . . . (II.)
§ 157, *c*, ... (II.)
Retribution—
Gosp. § 32, ... (I.)
Pet. § 51, *d*, . . . (I.)
Jas. § 57, ... (I.)
Pl. I. § 64, *b*, . . . (I.)
II. § 98, *c*, *d*, . . . (II.)
III. § 101, *c*, . . . (II.)
IV. § 108, *d*, . . . (II.)
Heb. § 126, *a*, . . . (II.)
Pet. II. § 129, *d*, . . . (II.)
Rev. § 132, *b*, . . . (II.)
Gosp. II. § 138, *c*, footnote 8, (II.)
John, § 151, *d*, . . . (II.)
§ 157, *d*, ... (II.)
Revelation—
Gosp. § 20, *a*, . . . (I.)

Revelation—*continued.* VOL.
Pl. II. § 71, *b*, . . . (I.)
§ 75, *a*, ... (I.)
§ 89, *b*, ... (II.)
III. § 102, *c*, . . . (II.)
Heb. § 116, *b*, . . . (II.)
Rev. § 130, *a*, . . . (II.)
§ 135, *d*, ... (II.)
John, § 143, *d*, . . . (II.)
§ 146, *c*, *d*, . . . (II.)
§ 147, *b*, *c*, . . . (II.)
§ 152, ... (II.)
Reward—
Gosp. § 32, *a–c*, . . . (I.)
Pet. § 51, *d*, ... (I.)
Pl. II. § 98, *d*, footnote 6, . (II.)
III. § 101, *c*, . . . (II.)
IV. § 108, *d*, . . . (II.)
Heb. § 126, *a*, . . . (II.)
Rev. § 132, *b*, . . . (II.)
John, § 151, *d*, . . . (II.)
Riches—
Gosp. § 26, *a*, *b*, . . . (I.)
Jas. § 55, *a*, ... (I.)
Pl. IV. § 107, *c*, footnote 5, . (II.)
Gosp. II. § 137, *b*, . . (II.)
Righteousness—
Gosp. § 21, *a*, . . . (I.)
§ 24, *a*, ... (I.)
Pet. § 45, *c*, ... (I.)
Jas. § 53, *b*, ... (I.)
Pl. II. § 65, ... (I.)
§ 82, *a*, ... (I.)
§ 84, *d*, ... (I.)
III. § 100, *a*, . . . (II.)
§ 101, *a*, ... (II.)
IV. § 108, *c*, . . . (II.)
Heb. § 115, *b*, . . . (II.)
§ 124, *c*, ... (II.)
§ 125, *c*, ... (II.)
Pet. II. § 128, *c*, footnote 5, ... (II.)
Rev. § 135, *a*, . . . (II.)
Gosp. II. § 139, *a*, footnote, . (II.)
John, § 147, *b*, . . . (II.)
§ 151, *a*, ... (II.)
Righteousness of God, The—
Pet. § 50, *d*, ... (I.)
Jas. § 56, *c*, ... (I.)
Pl. § 65, *c*, ... (I.)
John, § 147, *b*, footnote 8, . (II.)
Rudiments of the world (*στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου*)—
Pl. II. § 70, *b*, . . . (I.)
§ 72, *c*, ... (I.)
III. § 102, *c*, . . . (II.)
§ 106, *c*, ... (II.)
Comp. Heb. § 124, *d*, . . (II.)
Pet. II. § 129, *b*, . . . (II.)

SACRIFICE OF CHRIST—
Gosp. § 22, *c*, . . . (I.)

Sacrifice of Christ—*continued.* VOL.
Pl. II. § 80, *c*, ... (I.)
III. § 100, c (footnote 10), (II.)
Heb. § 121, ... (II.)
John, § 148, *b*, . . . (II.)
Sacrifice of Christians—
Pet. § 45, *c*, ... (I.)
Pl. III. § 105, *d*, . . . (II.)
Heb. § 123, *d*, . . . (II.)
Salvation (*σωτηρία*)—
Gosp. § 22, ... (I.)
§ 33, *c*, ... (I.)
§ 34, *c*, ... (I.)
Acts, § 40, *d*, . . . (I.)
Pet. § 44, *b*, ... (I.)
§ 50, *d*, ... (I.)
Jas. § 53, *b*, ... (I.)
§ 57, *d*, ... (I.)
Pl. I. § 61, ... (I.)
§ 64, *c*, ... (I.)
II. § 96, *b*, . . . (II.)
III. § 101, *c*, . . . (II.)
IV. § 108, *a*, . . . (II.)
Heb. § 126, *c*, . . . (II.)
Pet. II. § 127, *c*, . . . (II.)
§ 129, *c*, footnote 2, . . (II.)
Rev. § 135, *c*, . . . (II.)
Gosp. II. § 139, *c*, . . (II.)
John, § 148, *a*, . . . (II.)
Sanctification (*ἁγιασμός*)—
Pet. § 44, *b*, ... (I.)
Pl. I. § 61, *c*, . . . (I.)
§ 62, *a*, ... (I.)
II. § 86, *a*, . . . (I.)
III. § 101, *b*, . . . (II.)
IV. § 108, *c*, footnote 9, . (II.)
Heb. § 123, *b*, . . . (II.)
§ 124, *c*, ... (II.)
Rev. § 135, *a*, . . . (II.)
Sanctify, To (*ἁγνίζειν*)—
Pet. § 46, *b*, ... (I.)
Jas. § 55, *b*, ... (I.)
John, § 151, *c*, . . . (I.)
Satan—
Gosp. § 23, *a*, . . . (I.)
Pet. § 46, *d*, footnote 6, . (I.)
Jas. § 55, *b* (footnote 2), . (I.)
Pl. III. § 104, *b*, . . . (II.)
IV. § 109, *b*, . . . (II.)
Heb. § 122, *d*, . . . (II.)
Pet. II. § 128, *d*, . . . (II.)
Rev. § 133, *c*, *d*, . . . (II.)
Gosp. II. § 138, *d*, . . (II.)
John, § 153, ... (II.)
§ 156, *c*, ... (II.)
Scriptures, Use of the—
Pl. II. § 74, ... (I.)
§ 87, *d*, ... (I.)
IV. § 107, *a*, footnote 3, . (II.)
Heb. § 116, *c*, . . . (II.)
Pet. II. § 127, *b*, footnote 4, . (II.)
Rev. § 130, *c*, footnote 3, . (II.)

Scriptures, Use of the—*continued.* VOL.
Gosp. II. § 136, *b* (footnote 5), (II.)
John, § 152, *b* (footnote 4), . (II.)
Servant of God (Christ)—
Acts, § 38, *b*, . . . (I.)
Servants of God—
Gosp. § 26, *a*, . . . (I.)
§ 32, *a*, ... (I.)
Acts, § 40, *b*, . . . (I.)
Pet. § 45, *c*, ... (I.)
Pl. II. § 89, *b*, footnote 6, . (II.)
III. § 101, *d*, footnote 9. . (II.)
IV. § 109, *c*, footnote 7, . (II.)
Rev. § 132, *c*, footnote 4, . (II.)
§ 135, *a*, ... (II.)
Shepherd. *See* Flock.
Sinlessness of Christ—
Gosp. § 21, *d*, . . . (I.)
Acts, § 38, *b*, . . . (I.)
Pet. § 49, *a*, ... (I.)
Pl. II. § 78, *b*, . . . (I.)
III. § 103, *c*, . . . (II.)
Heb. § 119, *b*, . . . (II.)
John, § 143, *c*, . . . (II.)
§ 144, *d*, ... (II.)
§ 147, *b*, ... (II.)
Sins—
Gosp. § 21, *a*, . . . (I.)
Pet. § 46, *b*, ... (I.)
Jas. § 56, ... (I.)
Pl. II. § 66, *b*, *c*, . . . (I.)
Heb. § 115, *b*, . . . (II.)
John, § 148, *a*, . . . (II.)
§ 151, *a*, footnote 1, *c*, . (II.)
Sins against the Holy Ghost, Deadly, of weakness—
Gosp. § 22, *b*, . . . (I.)
Acts, § 42, *b*, . . . (I.)
Pet. § 44, *c*, ... (I.)
§ 50, *d*, ... (I.)
Heb. § 115, *b*, . . . (II.)
§ 125, *d*, ... (II.)
John, § 151, *c*, . . . (II.)
§ 154, *d*, ... (II.)
Slaves—
Pet. § 47, *c*, ... (I.)
Pl. II. § 93, *b*, . . . (II.)
III. § 106, *d*, . . . (II.)
IV. § 109, *c*, footnote 9, . (II.)
Son of David—
Gosp. § 19, *a*, *b*, . . . (I.)
Acts, § 39, *a*, footnote 1, . (I.)
Pl. II. § 78, *a*, *b*, footnote 3, (I.)
IV. § 110, *c*, . . . (II.)
Rev. § 134, *a*, . . . (II.)
Gosp. II. § 136, *b*, . . (II.)
Son of God—
Gosp. § 17, ... (I.)
Acts, § 39, *b*, footnote 3, . (I.)
Pet. § 50, *a*, footnote 1, . (I.)
Pl. I. § 61, *a*, . . . (I.)
II. § 77, ... (I.)
Son of God—*continued.* VOL.
Pl. III. § 103, *a*, . . . (II.)
Heb. § 118, *a*, *b*, . . . (II.)
Rev. § 134, *b*, . . . (II.)
Gosp. II. § 136, *a*, . . (II.)
§ 137, *a*, footnote 2, . (II.)
John, § 143, ... (II.)
§ 145, *a*, ... (II.)
Son of Man. *See* Man, Son of.
Sonship of believers—
Gosp. § 20, *c*, . . . (I.)
§ 34, *b*, ... (I.)
Pet. § 45, *d*, ... (I.)
(Jas. § 54, *c*), . . . (I.)
Pl. I. § 61, *b*, . . . (I.)
II. § 83, ... (I.)
III. § 100, *d*, . . . (II.)
IV. § 108, *a*, footnote 3, . (II.)
Heb. § 124, *a*, . . . (II.)
Pet. II. § 127, *a*, footnote 3, (II.)
Rev. § 132, *c*, footnote 4, . (II.)
Gosp. II. § 139, *c*, . . (II.)
John, § 150, *d*, . . . (II.)
§ 157, *d*, ... (II.)
Sonship of Israel—
Gosp. § 17, *b*, . . . (I.)
§ 20, *c*, ... (I.)
Pet. § 45, *d*, ... (I.)
Pl. II. § 71, *a*, . . . (I.)
Sonship = likeness to God—
Gosp. § 21, *c*, footnote 1, . (I.)
Pet. § 45, *d*, footnote 6, . (I.)
Pl. II. § 83, *d*, . . . (I.)
III. § 100, *d*, footnote 12, . (II.)
Heb. § 118, *b*, . . . (II.)
John, § 150, *d*, . . . (II.)
Soul—
Gosp. § 27, *b*, . . . (I.)
Pl. I. § 62, *a*, footnote 1, . (I.)
II. § 67, *d*, . . . (I.)
§ 68, *b*, *c*, . . . (I.)
Heb. § 126, *c*, footnote 6, . (II.)
Pet. II. § 128, *d*, footnote 7, (II.)
Soul of Christ—
Pl. II. § 78, *c*, footnote 4, . (I.)
John, § 145, *c* (footnote 12), . (II.)
Spirit of God—
Gosp. § 21, *c*, footnote 1, . (I.)
Acts, § 40, *a*, . . . (I.)
Pet. § 44, *b*, ... (I.)
Pl. I. § 61, *c*, ... (I.)
§ 62, *d*, ... (I.)
II. § 83, *c*, *d*, . . . (I.)
§ 84, *a*, *b*, . . . (I.)
§ 86, *a*, *b*, . . . (I.)
§ 87, *c*, ... (I.)
§ 92, *a*, ... (II.)
III. § 100, *d*, . . . (II.)
§ 101, *a*, *b*, . . . (II.)
IV. § 108, *c*, . . . (II.)
Heb. § 124, *b*, . . . (II.)

Spirit of God—*continued.* VOL.
Jude, § 128, *b*, footnote 4, . (II.)
Rev. § 135, *d*, . . . (II.)
Gosp. II. § 138, *a*, *b*, footnote 6, (II.)
§ 139, *d*, ... (II.)
John, § 155, ... (II.)
Spirit of Christ—
Gosp. § 18, *a*, footnote 2, . (I.)
Acts, § 38, *b*, . . . (I.)
Pet. § 48, ... (I.)
Pl. II. § 78, *d*, . . . (I.)
Heb. § 119, *c*, . . . (II.)
§ 121, *a*, footnote 1, . . . (II.)
Rev. § 134, *c*, . . . (II.)
John, § 145, *c*, *d*, . . . (II.)
Spirit of men—
Gosp. § 27, *c*, . . . (I.)
Pl. I. § 62, *a*, footnote 1, . (I.)
II. § 68, *c*, . . . (I.)
III. § 100, *a*, . . . (II.)
Gosp. II. § 139, *c*, footnote 7, (II.)
Spirits. *See* Angels, Daemons.
Sprinkling—
Pet. § 49, *c*, ... (I.)
Heb. § 123, *a*, . . . (II.)
Stephen's speech—
Acts, § 42, *d*, . . . (I.)
Substitution—
Gosp. § 22, *c*, . . . (I.)
Pet. § 49, *b*, ... (I.)
Pl. II. § 80, *b*, . . . (I.)
III. § 100, *c*, . . . (II.)
IV. § 108, *b*, . . . (II.)
Heb. § 122, *c*, . . . (II.)
John, § 148, *c*, . . . (II.)
Sufferings of Christ. *See* Death of Christ.
Sufferings of Christians—
Gosp. § 30, *a*, . . . (I.)
Pet. § 46, *d*, ... (I.)
§ 47, *d*, ... (I.)
§ 51, *b*, ... (I.)
Jas. § 55, *c*, ... (I.)
Pl. I. § 62, *b*, . . . (I.)
II. § 86, *c*, . . . (I.)
III. § 101, *b*, . . . (II.)
IV. § 108, *c*, . . . (II.)
Heb. § 124, *c*, . . . (II.)
Rev. § 130, *c*, . . . (II.)
John, § 156, *c*, . . . (II.)

TEMPLE—
Gosp. § 24, *d*, . . . (I.)
Pet. § 45, *a*, ... (I.)
Pl. II. § 71, *c*, . . . (I.)
§ 92, *a*, ... (II.)
III. § 106, *a*, . . . (II.)
Gosp. II. § 136, *c*, . . (II.)
John, § 152, *c*, . . . (II.)
Temptation of Jesus—
Gosp. § 23, *c*, . . . (I.)
Heb. § 119, *a*, . . . (II.)
Temptation of Jesus—*continued.* VOL.
Gosp. II. § 136, *a*, footnote 1, (II.)
§ 138, *a* (footnote 4), . (II.)
Testimony—
Rev. § 135, *b*, footnote 5, *d*, . (II.)
John, § 149, *b*, . . . (II.)
§ 155, *d*, ... (II.)
Thanksgiving—
Jas. § 55, *d*, ... (I.)
Pl. II. § 99, *d*, . . . (II.)
III. § 106, *c*, . . . (II.)
Rev. § 135, *a*, . . . (II.)
Times, The last—
Acts, § 40, *a*, *d*, . . . (I.)
Pet. § 48, *a*, ... (I.)
§ 51, *b*, ... (I.)
Pl. IV. § 110, *a*, . . . (II.)
Heb. § 117, *c*, . . . (II.)
Pet. II. § 129, *c*, . . . (II.)
John, § 157, *c* (comp. note *b*), (II.)
Tongue, Sins of—
Jas. § 56, *c*, ... (I.)
Tongues, Speaking with—
Pl. II. § 92, *c*, . . . (II.)
(Gosp. II. § 139, *d*), . . (II.)
Transfiguration of Jesus—
Pet. II. § 127, *b*, . . . (II.)
Gosp. II. § 136, *a*, . . (II.)
§ 138, *a*, ... (II.)
Trials. *See* Sufferings.
Truth—
Pet. § 46, *b*, ... (I.)
Jas. § 52, *a*, ... (I.)
Pl. II. § 65, *b*, . . . (I.)
III. § 100, *a*, . . . (II.)
§ 102, *d*, . . . (II.)
IV. § 107, *a*, . . . (II.)
Pet. II. § 127, *a*, footnote 1, . (II.)
§ 128, *a*, footnote 1, . . (II.)
John, § 147, *b*, . . . (II.)
Type—
Pl. II. § 73, *c*, . . . (I.)
III. § 105, *d*, . . . (II.)
Heb. § 115, *d*, . . . (II.)
§ 116, *c*, footnote 6, . . (II.)

UNITY OF BELIEVERS—
John, § 156, *a*, . . . (II.)
Unity of Christ with God—
John, § 143, *d*, . . . (II.)

VISION OF GOD—
Gosp. § 34, *b*, . . . (I.)
Pl. § 99, *b*, ... (II.)
Heb. § 126, *d*, . . . (II.)
Rev. § 132, *d*, . . . (II.)
John, § 144, *a*, . . . (II.)
§ 146, *b*, *c*, . . . (II.)
§ 157, *d*, ... (II.)

WHOREDOM—
Acts, § 43, *c*, . . . (I.)

Whoredom—*continued.* VOL.
Pl. II. § 95, *a*, . . . (II.)
Wisdom—
Jas. § 52, *b*, footnote 2, . . (I.)
§ 56, *d*, ... (I.)
Pl. III. § 102, . . . (II.)
(Comp. II. § 92, *b*, footnote 8), (II.)
Woman and Man. *See* Man.
Word of God (especially as a means of grace)—
Gosp. § 18, *c*, . . . (I.)
§ 21, *c*, ... (I.)
Acts, § 40, *b*, *c*, . . . (I.)
Pet. § 46, *a*, *c*, . . . (I.)
Jas. § 52, ... (I.)
Pl. I. § 61, *b*, . . . (I.)
§ 62, *c*, *d*, . . . (I.)
II. § 89, *a*, . . . (II.)
III. § 101, *d*, . . . (II.)
IV. § 107, *a*, . . . (II.)
Heb. § 116, *b*, . . . (II.)
Pet. II. § 128, *b*, footnote 4, . (II.)
Rev. § 135, *d*, . . . (II.)
Gosp. II. § 139, *b*, footnote 2, ... (II.)
John, § 143, *a*, footnote 1, . (II.)
John, § 150, *c*, . . . (II.)
Works—
Jas. § 53, ... (I.)
Pl. II. § 66, *b*, . . . (I.)
§ 82, *c*, ... (I.)
§ 98, *b*, ... (II.)
III. § 101, *b*, . . . (II.)
IV. § 108, *d*, footnote 10), (II.)
Rev. § 135, *a*, . . . (II.)
World (*κόσμος*)—
Pet. § 46, *b*, footnote 3, . (I.)
Jas. § 55, *a*, ... (I.)
Pl. II. § 67, *a*, . . . (I.)
III. § 100, *a*, . . . (II.)
IV. § 110, *c*, . . . (II.)
World—*continued.* VOL.
Pet. II. § 128, *b*, footnote 2, . (II.)
Gosp. II. § 138, *c*, footnote 8, (II.)
John, § 153, *a*, *d*, . . . (II.)
§ 156, *c*, *d*, . . . (II.)
World, Age of—
Pl. II. § 67, *a*, . . . (I.)
III. § 100, *a*, . . . (II.)
IV. § 110, *a*, . . . (II.)
Heb. § 117, *c*, . . . (II.)
Gosp. II. § 138, *c*, footnote 8, (II.)
World, Destruction of (transformation of world)—
Gosp. § 33, *c*, . . . (I.)
Pl. II. § 99, *b*, . . . (II.)
Heb. § 126, *b*, . . . (II.)
Pet. II. § 129, *b*, *d*, . . (II.)
Rev. § 132, *b*, *c*, . . . (II.)
Gosp. II. § 138, *c*, footnote 8, (II.)
John, § 157, *d*, footnote 9, . (II.)
World, End of—
Pl. II. § 99, *d*, . . . (II.)
III. § 103, *b*, . . . (II.)
Heb. § 120, *d*, . . . (II.)
Worship of God—
Pl. II. § 73, *c*, . . . (I.)
Heb. § 123, *d*, . . . (II.)
Rev. § 130, *c*, footnote 4, . (II.)
§ 132, *c*, footnote 4, . . (II.)
Worship of Idols—
Pl. II. § 69, *c*, . . . (I.)
§ 70, *c*, ... (I.)
III. § 100, *b*, . . . (II.)
Wrath of God—
Pl. II. § 66, *d*, . . . (I.)
§ 70, *d*, ... (I.)
III. § 100, *b*, . . . (II.)
John, § 157, *c*, footnote 8, . (II.)
Wrath of Man—
Jas. § 56, *c*, ... (I.

INDEX OF TEXTS.

MATTHEW.

CHAP. PAGE
i. 22, 23, . Vol. II. 299
iv. 2, . . II. 299
iv. 3–7, . I. 85
iv. 8–10, . I. 69, 89
iv. 11, . II. 336
v. 3, 4, 6, . I. 97, 127
v. 5, . . I. 153
v. 8, 9, . I. 155
v. 9, . . I. 116
v. 10, . I. 96, 127
v. 16, . I. 98
v. 17, . I. 98, 109
v. 17, 18, . I. 108, 112
v. 19, . I. 108, 145
v. 20–47, . I. 108 f.
v. 22, . I. 157
v. 23, 24, . I. 110, 116
v. 29, 30, I. 118, 134, 157
v. 37, . I. 104
v. 40–42, 44–47, I. 115 f.
v. 44, 45, . I. 101, 115
v. 45, . I. 94, 96
v. 45, 48, . I. 98, 113
vi. 1 ff., . I. 119
vi. 10, . I. 63 f., 92
vi. 11, . I. 94
vi. 12, . I. 100 f., 135
vi. 13, . I. 104, 135
vi. 21, . I. 119, 146
vi. 24, . I. 117 f., 143
vi. 25–33, . I. 94, 118
vi. 33, . I. 107, 117
vii. 1–5, . I. 116
vii. 7–11, . I. 93 f.
vii. 12, . I. 114
vii. 13, 14, I. 134
vii. 22, 23, . II. 289
vii. 24, . I. 96
vii. 24, 25, . I. 140
viii. 11, . I. 154 f.
viii. 11, 12, I. 129
viii. 12, . I. 147, 158
viii. 17, . II. 287
viii. 22, . I. 128
viii. 28, 29, I. 105 f.

MATTHEW—*continued.*

CHAP. PAGE
viii. 31, 32, I. 105
ix. 2, . I. 147
ix. 37, 38, . I. 139
x. 5, 6, . II. 290
x. 18, . I. 138
x. 20, . I. 98
x. 23, . II. 301
x. 26, 27, . I. 69, 139
x. 28, . I. 156 f.
x. 29, 30, . I. 94
x. 32, 33, I. 144, 146, 152
x. 37, 39, . I. 118
x. 38, . I. 134
x. 40, . I. 76, 86
x. 41, 42, . I. 145
xi. 3–5, . I. 65
xi. 5, . I. 63, 65, 84
xi. 6, . I. 66, 68
xi. 10, . I. 76, 382
xi. 11, . I. 68
xi. 13, . I. 66
xi. 16, 17, . I. 128
xi. 18, 19, . I. 75 f.
xi. 19, . I. 132
xi. 25, . I. 127 f., 132
xi. 27, . I. 78, 81, 93
xi. 28, . I. 97, 127
xi. 28–30, . I. 99
xii. 3–5, 8, I. 110
xii. 26, 27, I. 103, 105
xii. 28, . I. 65, 84
xii. 28, 29, I. 106
xii. 31, 32, I. 76, 100
xii. 33–37, I. 147
xii. 39, 40, I. 90
xii. 43, 45, I. 104 f.
xii. 50, . I. 98, 107
xiii. 3–9, . I. 68, 127 f.
xiii. 24–30, I. 70, 141, 152
xiii. 25, 28, II. 304
xiii. 31–33, I. 69, 149
xiii. 41, . II. 289
xiii. 42, 50, II. 303
xiii. 44–46, I. 69, 117
xiii. 47, 48, I. 70, 139, 141

MATTHEW—*continued.*

CHAP. PAGE
xv. 11–20, . II. 289
xv. 21, 29, . II. 290
xv. 24, . I. 128
xvi. 13, . I. 74
xvi. 17, . I. 122, 132
xvi. 18, . I. 141, 156
xvi. 18, 19, I. 139 f., 191
xvi. 27, . II. 289
xvii. 25–27, I. 82
xvii. 27, . II. 298
xviii. 3, 4, . I. 127
xviii. 6, 7, . I. 104, 157
xviii. 10, . II. 304
xviii. 15–18, I. 140 f.
xviii. 19, 20, I. 91, 111, 142
xviii. 23–27, I. 100
xviii. 28–35, I. 101, 137
xix. 10–12, I. 118
xix. 17, . I. 98
xix. 27, . II. 293
xix. 28, I. 138, 145, 154, II. 302
xx. 1–7, I. 126, 129, 144
xx. 8–16, . I. 145
xx. 25–27, . I. 116, 141
xxi. 37, . I. 82, 97
xxi. 43, . I. 129
xxii. 1–14, I. 129
xxii. 11–13, I. 107, 136, 152
xxii. 14, . I. 137
xxii. 36–40, I. 113 f.
xxiii. 2–4, . I. 107 f.
xxiii. 7–10, I. 116, 141
xxiii. 21, 23, I. 110
xxiii. 32–36, I. 150
xxiii. 34, . I. 138
xxiii. 37, . I. 126
xxiii. 38, . I. 151
xxiii. 39, . I. 89, 154
xxiv. 5–8, . I. 149 f.
xxiv. 11, 12, II. 301
xxiv. 15–33, I. 150 f.
xxiv. 20, . I. 110
xxiv. 22, . I. 121, 137

MATTHEW—*continued.*

CHAP. PAGE
xxiv. 26-28, I. 149
xxiv. 30, . II. 301
xxiv. 31, . I. 137, 152 f.
xxiv. 35, . I. 85
xxiv. 36, . II. 297
xxiv. 37-41, I. 151
xxiv. 42-44, I. 135
xxiv. 46, 47, I. 145
xxv. 1-30, . I. 135 f.
xxv. 12, . I. 137, 147
xxv. 29, . I. 136
xxv. 31-46, I. 115, 152, II. 291, 302
xxv. 34, . I. 137, 153
xxv. 41, . I. 106, 158
xxv. 42-45, I. 136
xxviii. 9, 17, 18, 20, II. 298
xxviii. 16-18, II. 287, 299
xxviii. 19, . I. 139 f., II. 290, 309
xxviii. 20, . II. 289

MARK.

i. 1, . . II. 284
i. 4, . . I. 187
i. 10, . . II. 298
i. 13, . . II. 284
i. 15, . I. 63, 96, 131
i. 17, . . I. 139, 151
i. 24, 34, 39, II. 285
ii. 17, . I. 96, 126
ii. 19, 20, . I. 66, 111
ii. 21, 22, . I. 112
ii. 27, 28, . I. 75
iii. 14, . I. 69, 138
iv. 11, . I. 69, 130
iv. 11, 12, . I. 133
iv. 15, . II. 304
iv. 19, . II. 302
iv. 20, . I. 127, 130
iv. 21, . I. 93
iv. 26-29, . I. 69, 134
v. 9, . . I. 105
v. 30, . II. 298
vi. 13, . I. 263
vii. 1-13, . I. 108
vii. 15, . I. 112
vii. 24, . II. 289
vii. 27, . II. 289
viii. 29, 30, I. 66, 83
viii. 31, 32, I. 90
viii. 33, I. 103 f., 117, 151
viii. 36, 37, I. 101, 119, 124
viii. 38, I. 77 f., 91, 153
ix. 1, . . I. 148, 153
ix. 2, . . II. 299
ix. 12, 13, I. 66, 77, II. 286
ix. 17, . II. 304
ix. 33-37, . I. 116 f.

MARK—*continued.*

CHAP. PAGE
ix. 38-40, . I. 131
x. 2-9, . I. 109
x. 14, 15, . I. 68, 127
x. 21-25, . I. 118
x. 27, . I. 133
x. 30, 31, . I. 145, 147, II. 301 f.
x. 37, . I. 154
x. 40, . I. 145
x. 45, I. 75, 101, 117
xi. 12-14, . I. 150
xi. 28-33, . I. 66
xii. 6, . I. 82
xii. 14-17, . I. 90
xii. 24-27, . I. 154
xii. 25, . I. 90, 92
xii. 35-37, . I. 86, 88 f.
xii. 41-44, . I. 115
xiii. 2, . I. 111, 151
xiii. 9-13, . II. 301
xiii. 10, I. 139, II. 290, 301
xiii. 19, 20, II. 301
xiii. 20, 22, I. 137, 149, 156
xiii. 32, I. 79, 82, 86, 148 f.
xiv. 12, I. 110, II. 288
xiv. 21, . I. 77, 158
xiv. 24, I. 102, 112, 122
xiv. 25, . I. 154
xiv. 27, . I. 382
xiv. 35, 36, I. 86, 102
xiv. 38, I. 104, 123, 135
xiv. 58, I. 112, II. 288
xiv. 61, . I. 80, 83
xiv. 62, I. 77, 82 f., 91

LUKE.

i. 35, . . II. 300
ii. 21-24, . II. 293
ii. 40, 52, . II. 297
iii. 21, 22, . II. 298
iii. 23, 38, . II. 300
iv. 25-27, . I. 129
iv. 39, . II. 304
v. 39, I. 112, II. 293
vi. 20-25, . II. 294
vi. 35, . II. 308
vii. 41, 43, 47, I. 100
x. 8, . II. 293
x. 18, 19, . I. 103, 105 f.
x. 20, . I. 104 f., 138
x. 29-37, . I. 115
x. 38-42, I. 96, II. 305
xi. 13, . II. 309
xi. 33-36, . I. 93, 128
xi. 41, . II. 294
xii. 5, . II. 309
xii. 10-12, . II. 309
xii. 15-21, . I. 118
xii. 32, I. 71, 137, 151

LUKE—*continued.*

CHAP. PAGE
xii. 33, . II. 294
xii. 37, . I. 144
xii. 58, 59, I. 100
xiii. 1-5, . I. 147
xiii. 6-9, . I. 150
xiii. 11, 13, 16, I. 104, II. 304
xiii. 30, . II. 292
xiv. 7-11, . I. 116, 145
xiv. 12-14, I. 115, 146
xiv. 14, . II. 309
xiv. 16-24, I. 126, 129, 154
xiv. 22, . II. 292
xiv. 28-33, I. 134
xiv. 34, 35, I. 136
xv. 4-10, . . I. 97, 126
xv. 11-32, . I. 100
xv. 24, 32, . I. 128
xvi. 1-9, I. 118, II. 294
xvi. 8, . I. 93
xvi. 15, I. 116, II. 305
xvi. 16, 17, II. 293
xvi. 19-31, I. 118, 156
xvi. 25, 26, II. 294
xvii. 1-4, I. 135, 142, 157
xvii. 7-10, I. 144, II. 305
xvii. 20, 21, I. 67, 69
xvii. 31, 32, II. 294
xviii. 2-8, I. 149, 152, 154
xviii. 10-14, I. 116, 128, II. 305
xix. 10, . I. 76, 99, 126
xix. 32, . II. 298
xx. 35, 36, . II. 308 f.
xxi. 12-28, . II. 301 f.
xxi. 36, . II. 309
xxii. 16, 30, I. 154
xxii. 19, 20, II. 305
xxii. 66, 70, I. 80
xxiii. 43, I. 156, II. 309
xxiii. 56, . II. 293
xxiv. 26, 39, 42, 43, 51, II. 299

JOHN.

i. 1-4, . II. 341 f.
i. 4, . . II. 350, 353
i. 5, . . II. 353
i. 10-12, . II. 367
i. 11, . . II. 391 f.
i. 12, 13, . II. 375 f.
i. 14, . . II. 339, 345
i. 15, 30, . II. 333
i. 17, . . II. 390
i. 17, 18, . II. 354
i. 18, . . II. 339
i. 29, . . II. 359
i. 32, 33, . II. 346, 366
i. 33, . . II. 409
i. 42, 44, 46, II. 399

JOHN—*continued.*

CHAP. PAGE
i. 52, . . II. 336, 346
ii. 4, . . II. 336
ii. 11, . II. 340
ii. 21, . II. 344
ii. 22, . II. 408
iii. 3, 5, . II. 347
iii. 3, 7, . II. 375
iii. 5, . . II. 409, 412
iii. 11-13, . II. 386
iii. 13, . II. 332, 335
iii. 14, 15, II. 335, 361, 363
iii. 15, . II. 350
iii. 15, 16, . II. 361
iii. 16, . II. 393
iii. 16, 17, . II. 333
iii. 17, . II. 396
iii. 18, . II. 419
iii. 18-20, . II. 396, 415
iii. 20, 21, . II. 392
iii. 21, . II. 355, 390
iii. 22, . II. 412
iii. 27, . II. 400
iii. 31, . II. 333, 386
iii. 32, . II. 366 f.
iii. 34, . II. 346, 405
iii. 36, . II. 419
iv. 2, . . II. 412
iv. 10, 14, . II. 352, 367
iv. 21, 23, . II. 389
iv. 22, . II. 385, 391
iv. 23, 24, . II. 356
iv. 34, . II. 336
iv. 37, 38, . II. 401
v. 17, . II. 389
v. 19, 20 (30), II. 327, 330, 336
v. 21-29, . II. 327 f.
v. 21 (24, 25, 27), II. 396
v. 22 (24, 27, 29), II. 418 f.
v. 24, . II. 348, 358
v. 26, . II. 330
v. 27, . II. 334 f.
v. 28, 29, . II. 418 f.
v. 29, . II. 384, 419
v. 30, . II. 419
v. 31, 32, . II. 366
v. 34-40, . II. 386
v. 36, 37, . II. 366
v. 38, . II. 392
v. 39, 42, . II. 390, 392
v. 40 (42, 44), II. 395
v. 45, 46, . II. 418
vi. 26, 27, . II. 328, 352
vi. 29, . II. 378
vi. 33-58, . II. 334, 351
vi. 35, . II. 351
vi. 37, 40, . II. 399
vi. 38, 40, . II. 334
vi. 39, 40, 44, 54, II. 348, 418

JOHN—*continued.*

CHAP. PAGE
vi. 44, . II. 415
vi. 44, 45, . II. 399
vi. 46, . II. 332
vi. 48, . II. 351
vi. 50 f., 57 f., II. 367
vi. 51, . II. 351, 360
vi. 51-56, II. 361, 367, 412
vi. 55, . II. 360 f.
vi. 56, 57, . II. 330, 369
vi. 57, . II. 350
vi. 58, . II. 361
vi. 60, 65, . II. 400
vi. 62, . II. 334 f.
vi. 63, II. 344 f., 352, 409
vi. 64, 66, . II. 399
vi. 68, . II. 352
vi. 69, . II. 365
vi. 70, . II. 396 f.
vii. 8, . II. 336
vii. 17, . II. 390
vii. 19, 22 f., II. 388 f.
vii. 29, . II. 332, 334
vii. 34, . II. 420
vii. 37, . II. 366 f.
vii. 37, 38, II. 352
vii. 38, 39, II. 409
vii. 39, II. 340, 405, 407
viii. 12, . II. 353
viii. 13, . II. 366
viii. 15, . II. 345
viii. 18, . II. 329, 366
viii. 19, . II. 356
viii. 21, . II. 420
viii. 21, 24, II. 358
viii. 23, . II. 333, 397
viii. 28, . II. 335, 415
viii. 29, . II. 336
viii. 31, . II. 369
viii. 32, 34, 36, II. 355
viii. 35, . II. 391
viii. 37, 39, II. 392
viii. 38, . II. 352
viii. 38-44, II. 376, 394
viii. 40, . II. 334
viii. 42, II. 333 f., 392
viii. 42, 47, II. 390
viii. 43, 47, II. 366, 395
viii. 44, . II. 394
viii. 50, . II. 418 f.
viii. 51, . II. 377
viii. 56, . II. 386
viii. 58, 59, II. 332 f.
ix. 22, 38, . II. 388
ix. 35-38, . II. 364
ix. 39, 41, . II. 396
x. 1-15, . II. 412
x. 8, . . II. 385, 392
x. 9, 10, . II. 362
x. 11, 12, 14, II. 360
x. 14, . II. 392

JOHN—*continued.*

CHAP. PAGE
x. 15, . II. 332
x. 16, II. 392, 412, 415
x. 17, 18, II. 336, 362, 402
x. 26, 27, . II. 392
x. 28-30, . II. 330 f.
x. 34, 35, . II. 388
x. 36, . II. 327, 346
x. 38, . II. 330, 365
xi. 4, . II. 344, 362
xi. 6, . II. 336
xi. 9, . II. 417
xi. 24-26, . II. 418
xi. 25, . II. 350
xi. 25, 26, . II. 348
xi. 33, . II. 345
xi. 41, 42, . II. 330
xi. 50-52, . II. 360
xi. 51, . II. 389
xi. 52, II. 392, 401, 415
xii. 16, . II. 340
xii. 22-24, . II. 391
xii. 23, . II. 335
xii. 24, . II. 401
xii. 25, 26, II. 384, 420
xii. 27, . II. 337
xii. 28, . II. 362
xii. 31, . II. 398, 419
xii. 32, II. 391, 401, 415
xii. 34, I. 74, II. 335
xii. 35, . II. 397
xii. 35, 36, . II. 353
xii. 36, . II. 364, 368
xii. 37, 38, II. 395
xii. 39, 40, II. 395
xii. 41, II. 338, 342, 385
xii. 45, . II. 326, 331
xii. 47, . II. 396
xii. 47, 48, II. 366 f.
xii. 48, . II. 418 f.
xii. 49, 50, II. 336, 352
xiii. 1, . II. 400
xiii. 3, . II. 329
xiii. 10, . II. 412
xiii. 14, 15, II. 357
xiii. 19, . II. 386
xiii. 21, . II. 345
xiii. 31, 32, II. 335, 337
xiii. 33, . II. 420
xiii. 34, 35, II. 378, 389, 413
xiv. 1, 2, . II. 363
xiv. 2, 3, II. 416 f., 420
xiv. 6, . II. 350, 354
xiv. 7-10, . II. 331
xiv. 10, 11, II. 329 f.
xiv. 12, . II. 401
xiv. 13, 14, II. 403
xiv. 15, 16, 17, II. 405 f.
xiv. 17, . II. 407, 409

JOHN—*continued.*

CHAP. PAGE
xiv. 18, 19, II. 401 f.
xiv. 19, 20, II. 330, 368, 402
xiv. 21, . II. 383, 402
xiv. 23, . II. 403
xiv. 26, II. 405 f., 408 f.
xiv. 27, . II. 337, 409
xiv. 28, . II. 337
xiv. 29, . II. 363
xiv. 30, 31, II. 397
xv. 1, . II. 412
xv. 1, 5, . II. 368
xv. 2 (6), . II. 399
xv. 3, . II. 352
xv. 4, . II. 369, 383
xv. 4, 5, . II. 369 f.
xv. 6, II. 369, 382, 419
xv. 7, . II. 369 f.
xv. 7, 8, . II. 403
xv. 8, . II. 401
xv. 10, . II. 336
xv. 11, . II. 337, 411
xv. 12 (17), II. 357, 413
xv. 13, . II. 362
xv. 15, . II. 401
xv. 16, . II. 403
xv. 19, II. 397, 400, 414
xv. 19-21, . II. 414
xv. 22-25, . II. 395 f.
xv. 26, . II. 406 f.
xv. 26, 27, . II. 366, 410
xvi. 7, . II. 405 f.
xvi. 8-11, . II. 409
xvi. 10, 11, II. 397
xvi. 12, . II. 408
xvi. 13-15, II. 406 ff.
xvi. 15, . II. 329
xvi. 16-22, II. 401 f.
xvi. 23, 24, II. 403
xvi. 25, . II. 408
xvi. 26, 27, II. 404
xvi. 28, . II. 334
xvi. 32, . II. 329
xvi. 33, . II. 397, 409
xvii. 1-3, . II. 349 f.
xvii. 4, 5, . II. 337
xvii. 5, II. 332 f., 336
xvii. 6, . II. 400 f.
xvii. 6, 9, . II. 392, 399
xvii. 8, . II. 364 f.
xvii. 9, . II. 413
xvii. 10, II. 329, 344, 362
xvii. 11, . II. 355, 411
xvii. 11, 12, II. 401
xvii. 12, . II. 397
xvii. 13, . II. 337, 411
xvii. 14, 16, II. 397
xvii. 15, . II. 398
xvii. 17, . II. 355, 401
xvii. 18, . II. 401

JOHN—*continued.*

CHAP. PAGE
xvii. 19, . II. 360, 401
xvii. 20-23, II. 411
xvii. 21, . II. 371 f.
xvii. 21, 22, II. 330
xvii. 21, 23, II. 398, 415
xvii. 22, . II. 401
xvii. 23, . II. 372
xvii. 24, . II. 420
xvii. 25, . II. 355 f.
xvii. 25, 26, II. 370
xviii. 37, . II. 388, 390
xix. 35, 37, II. 366, 410
xix. 36, . II. 359
xx. 9, 17, 19 f., 26, 30, II. 402
xx. 17, . II. 327
xx. 21-23, . II. 404 f.
xx. 28, . II. 337, 340
xx. 29, . II. 410
xx. 31, II. 338, 348, 350
xxi. 15-17, II. 411
xxi. 18-23, II. 416

ACTS.

i. 3, 9, . II. 299
i. 6, . . I. 194
i. 7, . . II. 297
i. 21-26, . I. 192
ii. 4-11, . II. 310
ii. 17, . I. 181
ii. 20, 21, . I. 180
ii. 24-32, . I. 178 f.
ii. 27, . I. 175
ii. 33, I. 179, 182, 188
ii. 33-35, . I. 179
ii. 36, I. 180, 184, 187
ii. 38, I. 182 f., 186 f.
ii. 39, I. 180, 193, 197
ii. 40, . I. 185, 187
ii. 42, . I. 188
iii. 13-15, . I. 183
iii. 14, . I. 175
iii. 15, . I. 178, 185
iii. 16, . I. 184
iii. 17, . I. 188, 193
iii. 18, 19, I. 176 f., 187
iii. 19-21, . I. 181, 194
iii. 22, . I. 175
iii. 23, . I. 194
iii. 24, . I. 173, 181
iii. 25, . I. 193, 197
iii. 26, I. 180, 183, 192
iv. 10, 30, . I. 178, 182
iv. 27, 30, . I. 175
v. 8-10, . I. 161, 190
v. 31, I. 185, 192, 194
v. 32, I. 179 f., 182 f.
vi. 1-6, I. 188 f., 190 f.
vi. 15, . II. 303

ACTS—*continued.*

CHAP. PAGE
vii. 2-53, I. 160, 195 f.
vii. 52, . I. 175
vii. 59, . II. 309
x. 30-35, 44-48, I. 198 f.
x. 36, I. 180, 187, 193
x. 38, . I. 175
x. 40, 41, . I. 178
x. 42, I. 181, 185, 192
x. 43, . I. 182, 184
xi. 20-26, . I. 180, 199
xi. 30, . I. 189
xii. 15, . II. 304
xiii. 23, 29, I. 403 f.
xiii. 33, . I. 400
xiii. 38, 39, II. 305
xiv. 15, . I. 355
xiv. 16, . I. 357
xiv. 17, . I. 353
xiv. 23, I. 191, II. 35
xv. 1-21, . I. 201 f.
xv. 11, I. 180, 184 f.
xv. 21, . I. 202
xv. 23, . I. 201
xv. 23, 28, I. 190
xvi. 3, . I. 486
xvi. 4, . I. 189, 201
xvi. 31, . I. 293
xvii. 22-31, I. 293
xvii. 26, . I. 333
xvii. 26, 27, I. 352
xvii. 29, . I. 355
xxi. 21, 24, I. 485 f.
xxi. 25, . I. 201
xxiv. 15, . II. 309

ROMANS.

i. 1, . . II. 12
i. 2, . . I. 376
i. 3, . I. 343, 399, 405 f.
i. 4, I. 399, 402, 408, 436
i. 5, . I. 391, II. 12
i. 7, . . II. 2
i. 11, . . II. 11
i. 16, . . II. 8, 19
i. 16, 17, . II. 53 f.
i. 17, . . II. 10
i. 18, . . I. 353, 355
i. 19-21, . I. 352 f.
i. 20, 21, .. I. 347, 349
i. 21-24, . I. 354 ff.
i. 21-28, . I. 361 f.
i. 23, . . I. 397
i. 25, . . I. 319, 355
i. 28, . I. 347 f., 353, 356
i. 32, . . I. 353, 356
ii. 1, 2, . I. 321, 326
ii. 1-6, . I. 366 f.
ii. 3, 5, 8, . I. 330
ii. 4, . . II. 4, 25

ROMANS—*continued.*

CHAP. PAGE
ii. 5, 6, . I. 321 f.
ii. 7–10, . I. 353
ii. 8, . . I. 319
ii. 9, . . I. 367
ii. 11, . I. 321
ii. 12, I. 330 f., 352 f., 367
ii. 13, . I. 321, 325
ii. 14, . I. 319, 356
ii. 14, 15, . I. 352 f.
ii. 15, . I. 349
ii. 16, . II. 65
ii. 17, . I. 363, 367
ii. 18, 20, . I. 364
ii. 21–23, . I. 326
ii. 25, . II. 23
ii. 25–29, . I. 367
ii. 26, 27, . I. 355
ii. 27, . I. 364
ii. 28, 29, . I. 366
iii. 1, 2, . I. 362 f., 373
iii. 3–5, . I. 375
iii. 4, 5, . I. 320 f.
iii. 5, 6, . I. 321 f.
iii. 9, I. 363, II. 17
iii. 10–19, I. 326 f., 366
iii. 19, 20, . I. 329, 371
iii. 19, 21, . I. 366, 376
iii. 21, I. 438, II. 10
iii. 23, . I. 326
iii. 24–26, . I. 425–428
iii. 25, . I. 425 f.
iii. 27, I. 443, II. 37
iii. 27, 28, . I. 324
iii. 29, 30, . II. 17 f.
iii. 31, . I. 366, 441
iv. 1, . . I. 343
iv. 2, . . I. 324
iv. 3, . . I. 441
iv. 4, 5, . I. 443
iv. 5–8, 11, I. 439
iv. 9–13, . II. 20
iv. 13, 14, . II. 62
iv. 13–16, . I. 373 f.
iv. 15, . I. 236, 369
iv. 16, 17, . II. 20 f.
iv. 18–20, 24, 25, I. 444
iv. 23, 24, . I. 378
iv. 25, . I. 437 f.
v. 1, . . I. 430
v. 3, 4, . I. 479
v. 5, . . I. 450
v. 5–11, I. 448, II. 52 f.
v. 8, . . I. 400, 421
v. 9, . I. 426, 430, 437
v. 10, I. 400, II. 59
v. 10, 11, . I. 429 f.
v. 12, . I. 333–335
v. 13, 14, I. 328, 330, 336
v. 14, I. 354, 378, 409
v. 15, . I. 389

ROMANS—*continued.*

CHAP. PAGE
v. 15–19, I. 335, 430, 439
v. 17, . II. 63
v. 17, 18, 21, I. 322
v. 18, 19, . I. 433, II. 3
v. 19, . I. 333, 421
v. 20, . I. 370
vi. 1–3, . I. 454 f.
vi. 3, . . I. 459
vi. 4, . . I. 400 f., 404
vi. 5, . . I. 354, 435
vi. 6, . . I. 350
vi. 7, . . I. 465
vi. 8–10, . II. 56
vi. 9, . . I. 407
vi. 10, . I. 433
vi. 11, . I. 462
vi. 12, . I. 350
vi. 12, 13, 14, I. 474 f.
vi. 13, 17, 20, I. 327 f.
vi. 14, 15, . I. 369, 483
vi. 18, 19, 22, I. 465, 474
vi. 22, 23, . II. 55
vii. 1–4, 6, I. 483 f.
vii. 5, 7–14, I. 368 f.
vii. 7, 8, . I. 328
vii. 9, 10, I. 371, II. 55
vii. 13, . I. 357, 371
vii. 14, . I. 344
vii. 14–21, . I. 328 f.
vii. 18, . I. 338, 346
vii. 22, 23, I. 348 f.
vii. 24, . I. 371
vii. 25, . I. 346–349
viii. 1, . I. 465
viii. 1, 2, . I. 458
viii. 2, I. 456, II. 55
viii. 3, I. 345, 350, 400, 406 f., 413, 431 f.
viii. 4, . I. 473, 483
viii. 6, . II. 55
viii. 7, . I. 428 f.
viii. 7, 8, . I. 345
viii. 9, 10, . II. 55 f.
viii. 9–11, . I. 456 f.
viii. 10, 11, II. 59 f.
viii. 12, 13, I. 345, 474
viii. 13, I. 331, 350, II. 55 f.
viii. 14, . I. 452
viii. 15, . I. 449 f.
viii. 16, I. 452 f., 477
viii. 17, I. 402, 478, II. 62
viii. 19, 23, I. 449, II. 61
viii. 19–22, II. 71
viii. 21, 23, II. 60, 69
viii. 23, . I. 425, 451
viii. 24, . II. 54
viii. 26, 27, I. 456, 477
viii. 28, . II. 2
viii. 28–30, II. 6

ROMANS—*continued.*

CHAP. PAGE
viii. 29, I. 402, II. 61
viii. 30, I. 466, II. 3, 8
viii. 32, I. 400, 420, 448
viii. 34, I. 430, 436, 439
viii. 38, . II. 56, 105
viii. 38, 39, I. 448
ix. 1, . I. 476
ix. 1–3, . II. 23
ix. 4 (5), I. 363, 365, 373
ix. 5, I. 343, 393, 406
ix. 6–12, . II. 23 f.
ix. 7, 8, . I. 363
ix. 8, . I. 343
ix. 11, . II. 2, 5
ix. 13, 17, . II. 4
ix. 15, 16, 18, II. 3
ix. 16, . II. 5
ix. 20–22, . II. 4 f., 25
ix. 23, . II. 4, 7, 61
ix. 23, 24, . II. 3, 18
ix. 25, 26, . I. 363
ix. 27–29, . II. 27
ix. 30–32, . II. 24 f.
ix. 31, . I. 438
x. 1, . II. 23, 27
x. 3–5, . I. 324, 438
x. 3–13, . II. 25
x. 4, . . I. 372, 482
x. 6, . . I. 415
x. 7, 9, . I. 437
x. 11–14, . I. 444
x. 12, 13, I. 392, II. 18
x. 14, 15, . II. 12
x. 16–21, . II. 25
x. 17, . II. 7
xi. 1–7, . II. 27
xi. 2, . . II. 6, 22
xi. 5, . . II. 5
xi. 7–10, . II. 25, 27
xi. 11–15, . II. 27
xi. 12, 15, . II. 26, 64
xi. 16, . I. 363
xi. 16–24, . II. 19, 22
xi. 17, . II. 24
xi. 19, 20, . II. 26
xi. 20–22, . I. 481
xi. 20–32, . II. 28 f.
xi. 25, . II. 27
xi. 28, . I. 363, 429
xi. 28, 29, . II. 2, 22 f.
xi. 28, 30, . II. 26
xi. 29, . I. 375
xi. 32, . II. 3
xi. 36, . II. 74
xii. 1, . I. 489
xii. 2, . I. 348, 475
xii. 3, . II. 36
xii. 3, 4, 6, I. 445, II. 33
xii. 5, I. 459, II. 31
xii. 6, . II. 33

ROMANS—*continued.*

CHAP. PAGE
xii. 7, 8, . II. 34 f.
xii. 9–16, . II. 38
xii. 11, . I. 473
xii. 19, . I. 329
xiii. 1–7, . II. 42 f.
xiii. 4, . I. 329
xiii. 8–10, . I. 483, 489, II. 38
xiii. 11, 12, II. 64
xiii. 13, 14, I. 474
xiii. 14, . I. 328, 478
xiv. 1, 2, 22 f., I. 445
xiv. 1–23, . II. 39–41
xiv. 8, 9, . I. 434
xiv. 17, . II. 72
xv. 1, 2, . II. 41
xv. 4, I. 377, 479, II. 66
xv. 5 9, . II. 74
xv. 8, . I. 373, 375
xv. 8, 9, . II. 18
xv. 10, . I. 382
xv. 18, 19, 20, II. 15
xvi. 19, . II. 93
xvi. 26, . I. 376, 386

1 CORINTHIANS.

i. 8, 9, . II. 2
i. 9, I. 402, II. 61
i. 12–16, I. 454, II. 12
i. 17, . II. 10 f.
i. 18, . II. 8, 10 f.
i. 20–25, . II. 91 f.
i. 21, I. 352, 354, II. 8
i. 26, . II. 7
i. 26–28, . II. 3, 6 f.
i. 30, I. 424 f., 465 f.
ii. 4, 5, . II. 7 f.
ii. 6, 7, . II. 34, 93
ii. 8, . I. 396
ii. 9, . I. 383, II. 6
ii. 10, 11, . I. 456 f.
ii. 11, . I. 346 f.
ii. 12, . I. 331 f.
ii. 12, 13, . II. 11, 14
ii. 14, . I. 338 f.
ii. 16, . I. 347, 408
iii. 1, 3, . I. 345, 474
iii. 3, 4, . I. 344
iii. 8, 9, . II. 32, 68
iii. 10, II. 12, 15, 32
iii. 11, . II. 32
iii. 13–15, . II. 65
iii. 16, . I. 457
iii. 16, 17, . II. 31
iii. 23, . I. 394, 454
iv. 4, 5, II, 63, 65, 69
iv. 8, . II. 63
iv. 10, . II. 92
iv. 15, 17, . II. 7, 15

1 CORINTHIANS—*contd.*

CHAP. PAGE
iv. 17, . I. 478
iv. 20, . II. 72
v. 2, 5, 11, 13, II. 31
v. 4, 5, . II. 15
v. 5, . I. 476
v. 7, . I. 426
v. 10, . I. 355
vi. 1–8, . II. 43
vi. 2, 3, . II. 63
vi. 3, . II. 108 f.
vi. 9–20, . II. 47 f.
vi. 11, . I. 454, 465 f.
vi. 12, 13, . II. 39 f.
vi. 15–20, . I. 489
vi. 16, 17, . I. 457
vi. 19, 20, . I. 464
vi. 20, I. 424, II. 74
vii. 1, 7, 8, II. 50
vii. 2–7, 9, . II. 48 f.
vii. 10–17, . II. 49 f.
vii. 14, I. 464, II. 49
vii. 17–20, . I. 485 f., II. 2, 42
vii. 19, . I. 317
vii. 21–23, . II. 43 f.
vii. 23, . I. 424, 464
vii. 25–40, . II. 51 f.
vii. 25, 35, 40, II. 14
vii. 26, 28, II. 64
vii. 29, . II. 64
vii. 31, . II. 71
vii. 34, . I. 475 f.
vii. 39, . II. 49, 56
viii. 1, . II. 37
viii. 3, . II. 6
viii. 4, . I. 355, 360
viii. 5, 6, . I. 360, 394
viii. 6, . I. 415
viii. 7–13, . II. 39 ff.
ix. 1, . II. 13, 15
ix. 2, . II. 15
ix. 9, 10, I. 377, 380, 488
ix. 15–18, . II. 69
ix. 19–22, I. 486 f., II. 41
ix. 23, . II. 66
ix. 24, 25, . II. 68
ix. 24–27, . II. 50
x. 1–4, . I. 467
x. 2, . I. 454
x. 4, 9, . I. 416
x. 6, . I. 378
x. 11, I. 377 f., 386
x. 13, . II. 1
x. 16, 17, I. 469 f., II. 31
x. 18, . I. 343, 365
x. 19, . I. 355, 360
x. 20, 21, . I. 360
x. 23, 30, 31, II. 40
x. 32, . II. 30
xi. 1, . I. 487

1 CORINTHIANS—*contd.*

CHAP. PAGE
xi. 3, . I. 394
xi. 3–15, . II. 44 ff.
xi. 10, . II. 105
xi. 20–22, . I. 471
xi. 23–26, . I. 468–471
xi. 25, . I. 426
xi. 27–30, . I. 472
xi. 30, . II. 56, 68
xii. 2, . I. 355, 360
xii. 3, . I. 455
xii. 4–7, 11, 12, 14, 19 f., II. 33
xii. 8, 9, . II. 34 f., 93
xii. 11, . I. 457
xii. 13, . I. 455, 459, II. 18, 31
xii. 15–18, 21–26, II. 37
xii. 27, . II. 32
xii. 28–30, . II. 33 ff.
xii. 31, . II. 37
xiii. 1–3, . II. 37
xiii. 2, . II. 34 f.
xiii. 3, . II. 68
xiii. 7, . I. 444
xiii. 8–12, II. 37, 71, 93
xiii. 13, . II. 37
xiv. 2–16, 21–28, II. 33 ff.
xiv. 14–16, 19, I. 347, 476
xiv. 21, . I. 366
xiv. 24, 25, 29–33, II. 33 ff.
xiv. 34, . I. 366, 488
xiv. 34–36, . II. 46
xv. 2, . I. 481
xv. 3–11, I. 403, II. 16 f.
xv. 10, . I. 481
xv. 11, 17, . I. 436, 447
xv. 18, 19, . II. 57
xv. 20–23, I. 409, II. 59
xv. 22–24, . II. 70 ff.
xv. 24, . I. 395, 400
xv. 24, 25, . II. 65, 108
xv. 24–28, . II. 73
xv. 26–28, . II. 69 f., 72
xv. 28, . I. 400, 418
xv. 31, . I. 478, 480
xv. 32, . II. 57, 68
xv. 36–50, . II. 60 ff.
xv. 40, 41, . I. 396 f.
xv. 44, 45, I. 338, 397 f.
xv. 45–47, . I. 410 f.
xv. 47–50, . I. 336–338
xv. 48, 49, . I. 397
xv. 50–52, . II. 64, 70
xv. 56, . I. 330, 369
xv. 58, . II. 69

2 CORINTHIANS.

i. 4–6, . II. 6, 66
i. 12, . I. 341, 481

2 CORINTHIANS—*contd.*

CHAP. PAGE
i. 14, . II. 69
i. 19, 20, . I. 399
i. 21, . I. 398, 459
i. 22, . I. 451
i. 23, . I. 338
ii. 14, 15, . II. 92
ii. 15, 16, . II. 8
iii. 3, I. 456, II. 12
iii. 5, 6, . II. 11 f.
iii. 6, I. 369, II. 12
iii. 6, 14, . I. 426
iii. 11, 13, 14, I. 372
iii. 13–16, I. 380, II. 26, 28
iii. 17, I. 398, 457, 483
iii. 18, I. 396 f., 478
iv. 3, . II. 8
iv. 4, . I. 332, 396
iv. 6, . II. 92
iv. 10, 11, . I. 463, 478
iv. 13, . I. 445
iv. 16, I. 351, 475 f.
iv. 17, . II. 66
v. 1, . II. 61
v. 1–4, . II. 70
v. 2, 4, 8, . II. 56 f.
v. 4, 5, . II. 59
v. 5, . I. 451
v. 7, . I. 445
v. 10, . II. 65–67
v. 14, 15, I. 421 f., 433
v. 16, . I. 406
v. 17, . I. 463
v. 18–20, . I. 429
v. 20, . II. 11 f.
v. 21, I. 404, 407, 421 f.
vi. 16, . II. 31
vi. 18, . I. 448
vii. 1, I. 340, 475 f.
vii. 10, . II. 66
viii. 1, 5, . I. 481
viii. 9, I. 389, 405, 415
ix. 6–11, . II. 68
ix. 8, 10, 14, I. 481
x. 8, 4, . I. 343
xi. 2, . . II. 32
xi. 3, . . I. 332, 476
xi. 15, . II. 67
xi. 18, . I. 343
xii. 7, . II. 108
xii. 9, 12, . II. 15
xii. 15, . I. 338
xiii. 4, . I. 407
xiii. 5, . I. 460
xiii. 14, . I. 457

GALATIANS.

i. 1, . . I. 400 f.
i. 1, 12, . I. 393

GALATIANS—*continued.*

CHAP. PAGE
i. 4, . . . I. 421, 425
i. 6, . . . I. 389, II. 7
i. 11, 12, . I. 278 f.
i. 12–ii. 21, II. 13
i. 15, . . I. 387
i. 16, . I. 342, 399, 414
i. 19, . . II. 16
ii. 3, 4, . I. 484
ii. 7–9, . II. 12, 15 f.
ii. 12–14, . I. 202 f.
ii. 15, . I. 367
ii. 16, . I. 442
ii. 19, 20, . I. 484
ii. 20, I. 343, 460, 463
ii. 20, 21, . I. 444
ii. 21, I. 324, 387, 430
iii. 2, 5, I. 442, 445, 460
iii. 2–9, . II. 21
iii. 3, . I. 343, 474
iii. 8, . I. 377 f.
iii. 10–14, . I. 423 f.
iii. 11, . I. 325, 377
iii. 13, . I. 424 f.
iii. 14, . I. 460
iii. 16, . I. 384, 392
iii. 16–21, . I. 374 f.
iii. 19, . I. 365, 372
iii. 19, 20, . I. 370
iii. 19–25, . I. 371 f.
iii. 21, I. 322, II. 55
iii. 22, . I. 327
iii. 23, I. 369, 442 f.
iii. 27, 28, . I. 459
iii. 27–29, I. 453, II. 20
iii. 28, . II. 43
iii. 28, 29, . II. 62
iv. 1–3, . I. 373, 482
iv. 3, 9, . I. 358, 372
iv. 4, . I. 386, 417
iv. 4, 5, I. 412, f., 482
iv. 5, . I. 425
iv. 6, I. 449 f., 452, 456
iv. 7, . . II. 62
iv. 8, . . I. 352
iv. 9, . . II. 6, 9
iv. 13, 14, . I. 337
iv. 19, . I. 457
iv. 21, . I. 488
iv. 22–31, . I. 380, 483, II. 26
iv. 25, 26, . II. 19
v. 1, . . I. 482
v. 3, . . I. 484
v. 4, . . I. 387
v. 5, I. 441, 451, 481
v. 5, 6, . I. 441, 480
v. 6, I. 458, 461, II. 18
v. 7, 8, . II. 7
v. 11, . I. 419, 486
v. 13, I. 341, 474, 482 f.

GALATIANS—*continued.*

CHAP. PAGE
v. 13, 14, . I. 483, 489
v. 16, 17, . I. 473
v. 18, . I. 455, 483
v. 24, . I. 461
vi. 8, . I. 474, II. 55, 67, 72
vi. 14, . I. 461, 463
vi. 15, . II. 18
vi. 16, I. 343, II. 21, 27
vi. 17, . I. 478

EPHESIANS.

i. 3, 4, . II. 97 f.
i. 4–6, . II. 90
i. 7, . . II. 81
i. 8, 9, . II. 94
i. 9, 10, . II. 79
i. 10, II. 99, 105 f., 109
i. 11–14, . II. 114 f.
i. 17, . II. 103, 105
i. 17–19, . II. 95
i. 20, . . II. 102, 111
i. 21, . II. 100, 106 f.
i. 22, . . II. 112
i. 23, . II. 104, 113 f.
ii. 1, 5, 6, . II. 110
ii. 2, . . II. 107 f.
ii. 2, 3, . II. 78 f.
ii. 6, . . II. 111
ii. 8, 9, . II. 79, 83
ii. 10, . II. 87
ii. 11, . II. 118
ii. 12, II. 78 f., 110
ii. 12, 13, . II. 115
ii. 14–17, II. 86, 114 ff.
ii. 18, . II. 111, 121
ii. 19, . II. 115
ii. 20–22, . II. 119 f.
iii. 3–5, . II. 79
iii. 5, . . II. 119
iii. 6, . . II. 114
iii. 9, 10, . II. 94, 107
iii. 9, 11, . II. 97 f.
iii. 12, . II. 111
iii. 15, . II. 106, 110
iii. 16, 17, I. 349, II. 77, 86
iii. 19, II. 95, 103, 113
iv. 1, . . II. 90
iv. 2, . . II. 121
iv. 3–6, . II. 119
iv. 5, . . II. 83 f.
iv. 6, . . II. 114
iv. 7–11, . II. 120
iv. 8, . . II. 109
iv. 8, 9, . II. 100
iv. 10, . II. 100, 102
iv. 12–16, II. 112 f., 120
iv. 13–16, . II. 95

EPHESIANS—*continued.*

CHAP. PAGE
iv. 17–19, . II. 78, 110
iv. 21, 22, . II. 76
iv. 23, . II. 77, 86
iv. 24, . II. 110
iv. 25, 29, 31, II. 122 f.
iv. 27, . II. 107, 109
iv. 30, . II. 81, 87 f.
v. 2, II. 81 f., 117, 121 f.
v. 5, 12, . II. 78
v. 5, 7, 11, 18, II. 122
v. 8–16, . II. 96
v. 11–16, . II. 122
v. 14, . I. 382
v. 19, . II. 123
v. 22–33, II. 112 f., 123 f.
v. 25, 26, . II. 84
v. 32, . I. 380
vi. 1–9, . II. 124
vi. 2, . II. 118
vi. 5, . II. 77
vi. 11–13, 16, II. 108 f., 110
vi. 17, . II. 90

PHILIPPIANS.

i. 8, 21, . II. 85
i. 9, . . II. 96
i. 19, 20, 28, II. 89
i. 21, 23, . II. 89
i. 27, . I. 445, II. 119
i. 29, . . II. 90
ii. 2, . . II. 119, 121
ii. 3, 4, . II. 121
ii. 5–9, . II. 104
ii. 6–8, . II. 100 ff.
ii. 9–11, . II. 102 f.
ii. 10, . II. 107, 109
ii. 12, 13, . II. 88
ii. 15, 16, II. 95 f., 110
iii. 2, 3, . II. 117 f.
iii. 6, . II. 76
iii. 7, 8, . II. 118
iii. 8, . II. 95
iii. 8, 9, . II. 85
iii. 9, . II. 82, 116
iii. 10, . II. 82, 86
iii. 10, 11, . II. 89
iii. 12, 13, . II. 87
iii. 12–15, . II. 121
iii. 14, . II. 90, 97
iii. 18, . II. 114
iii. 20, . II. 111
iii. 20, 21, . II. 88 f., 90
iii. 21, II. 100, 103, 109
iv. 3, . . II. 88 f.
iv. 5, . . II. 122
iv. 7, . . II. 77
iv. 8, . . II. 122

COLOSSIANS.

CHAP. PAGE
i. 4, 5, . II. 88, 121
i. 12, . . II. 111
i. 13, . . II. 108, 111
i. 13, 14, . II. 104, 109
i. 14, . . II. 81
i. 15–17, . II. 98 f., 104
i. 16, . . II. 106
i. 18, . II. 89, 102 ff., 112
i. 19, . . II. 103 f.
i. 20, . II. 99, 106 f., 109
i. 20, 21, 22, II. 80 ff.
i. 22, . . II. 102
i. 24, . . II. 86, 112
i. 25–27, . II. 94 f.
i. 28, . . II. 120
ii. 2, . . II. 105, 121
ii. 2, 3, 8, . II. 94
ii. 9, . . II. 103 f.
ii. 11, 12, . II. 117 f.
ii. 12, 13, . II. 110
ii. 14, . . II. 80 f., 116
ii. 15, . II. 108
ii. 16, 17, 20, II. 117
ii. 18, 23, . II. 77, 106
ii. 19, . II. 113
ii. 20, II. 78, 111, 116
iii. 1–5, . II. 111
iii. 3, 4, . II. 88
iii. 5, . . II. 78
iii. 9, 10, . II. 87, 110
iii. 11, . II. 116
iii. 14, 15, . II. 121
iii. 15, . II. 90, 119
iii. 16, . II. 123
iii. 18–25, . II. 123 f.
iii. 22, . II. 77
iv. 5, 6, . II. 122

1 THESSALONIANS.

i. 1, . . I. 298
i. 4–6, I. 295 f., 302, 304
i. 8, . . I. 297
i. 9, 10, . I. 293 f.
ii. 4, 6, . II. 12, 16
ii. 11, 12, . I. 296, 303
ii. 13, . I. 295, 303
ii. 14–16, 18, I. 306
iii. 3–5, . I. 302
iii. 8, . . I. 302, 304
iii. 12, 13, . I. 301
iii. 13, . I. 300, 312
iv. 1, 2, . I. 301
iv. 3, 6, . I. 300
iv. 4, 5, . II. 48
iv. 7, . . I. 296 f.
iv. 8, 9, . I. 303 f.
iv. 12, . I. 302
iv. 13–17, I. 313 f., II. 56
iv. 15, 17, . I. 311

1 THESSALONIANS—*contd.*

CHAP. PAGE
v. 4, 5, . I. 297
v. 5–8, . I. 301 f.
v. 9, . . I. 296, 298
v. 10, . . I. 298, 314
v. 18, 22, 23, I. 300
v. 19–21, . I. 304
v. 23, 24, . I. 303

2 THESSALONIANS.

i. 1, . . I. 298
i. 6, 7, . I. 312 f., 322
i. 8, . . I. 298, 312 f.
i. 9, 10, . I. 312 f.
i. 11, . I. 296, 298, 300
i. 12, . . I. 294, 298 f.
ii. 1, . . I. 312, 314
ii. 2, 3, . I. 304 f.
ii. 3–12, . I. 306–311
ii. 3, . . I. 350
ii. 11, 12, . I. 297 f.
ii. 13, . I. 296 f., 298
ii. 13, 14, . I. 295 f.
iii. 1, 2, . I. 306
iii. 2–5, I. 296 f., 302 f.
iii. 14, 15, . II. 31
iii. 16, . I. 302

1 TIMOTHY.

i. 1, . . II. 132
i. 3, 4, . II. 127 f.
i. 4, . . II. 134
i. 5, 6, . II. 127 f.
i. 8–11, . II. 127
i. 12–16, . II. 133, 139
i. 17, . II. 148
ii. 1, 2, . II. 146
ii. 4, . . II. 139
ii. 5, . . II. 147
ii. 6, . . II. 133
ii. 7, . . II. 126
ii. 8–15, . II. 141 f.
ii. 15, . . II. 137
iii. 1–7, . II. 143
iii. 6, 7, . II. 141
iii. 8–13, . II. 144
iii. 9, . . II. 128 f.
iii. 13, . II. 138
iii. 15, . II. 140
iii. 15, 16, . II. 129
iii. 16, . II. 147
iv. 1–5, . II. 145
iv. 6, . . II. 126
iv. 8, 10, . II. 137 f.
iv. 9, . . II. 126
iv. 10, . II. 139
iv. 14, . II. 144
iv. 16, . II. 137
v. 3–16, . II. 144

1 TIMOTHY—*continued.*

CHAP. PAGE
v. 14, 15, . II. 142
v. 17, 18, 19–22, II. 143
v. 21, . . II. 138
vi. 1, . . II. 125
vi. 1, 2, . II. 142
vi. 3, . . II. 126, 129
vi. 3, 4, . II. 127 f.
vi. 5, . . II. 130
vi. 6, . . II. 137
vi. 10, . II. 128 f.
vi. 12, 13, . II. 147
vi. 14, 15, . II. 146
vi. 15, 16, . II. 148
vi. 19, . II. 138
vi. 20, 21, . II. 127 f.

2 TIMOTHY.

i. 1, . . II. 132
i. 7, 8, . II. 135
i. 9, . II. 133 f., 139
i. 10, . . II. 132 f.
i. 12, 14, . II. 134 f.
i. 16, 18, . II. 138
ii. 8, . . II. 147
ii. 10, . . II. 139
ii. 11, 12, II. 135, 137 f.
ii. 16, 17, . II. 130
ii. 18–21, . II. 140
iii. 1–5, . II. 145
iii. 8, . . II. 130
iii. 15, 16, . II. 127, 137
iv. 6, . . II. 127
iv. 8, . . II. 137

TITUS.

i. 1, . II. 129, 138 f.
i. 2, . . II. 132
i. 5–9, . II. 143
i. 15, 16, . II. 131
ii. 4, 5, 9, 10, II. 141 f.
ii. 11, . . II. 140
ii. 11, 12, . II. 136
ii. 13, . . II. 146 f.
ii. 14, . . II. 133
iii. 3, . . II. 131
iii. 4, . . II. 132 f.
iii. 5, . . II. 133 f.
iii. 5–7, . II. 135
iii. 7, . . II. 132 f.
iii. 9, 10, . II. 127 f.
iii. 10, 11, . II. 130

PHILEMON.

vv. 10–21, . II. 124 f.

HEBREWS.

i. 1, . II. 174, 181, 184
i. 2, . . II. 188

HEBREWS—*continued.*

CHAP. PAGE
i. 3, . II. 187–189, 212
i. 4, . . II. 184 f.
i. 5, 6, . II. 185 f.
i. 6, 7, . II. 198 f.
i. 8, 9, . II. 184
i. 9, . . II. 185
i. 10–12, II. 183, 199, 200
i. 13, 14, . II. 198 f.
ii. 1, . . II. 226
ii. 2, . . II. 168 f.
ii. 2–4, . II. 174
ii. 3, . . II. 183, 190
ii. 4, . . II. 220
ii. 5, . II. 198 f., 200
ii. 6, . . II. 175
ii. 6, 7, . II. 191
ii. 8, 9, . II. 199 f.
ii. 9, II. 180, 201, 209, 217
ii. 10, . . II. 193, 200, 218 f., 233
ii. 11, . . II. 186, 191
ii. 14, . . II. 192
ii. 14, 15, . II. 210
ii. 16, . . II. 199
ii. 17, . . II. 208
ii. 17, 18, . II. 192
ii. 18, . . II. 200, 222
iii. 1, II. 179, 184, 191
iii. 2, . . II. 186
iii. 3, 4, 6, . II. 189
iii. 6, . II. 179, 217, 224
iii. 9, . . II. 232
iii. 12, . II. 180, 221
iii. 12, 13, II. 222, 228 f.
iii. 14, . II. 220, 224
iii. 15–19, . II. 169, 228
iv. 2, 6, . II. 167, 226
iv. 3, 4, 8–10, II. 234
iv. 7, . . II. 175
iv. 11, . II. 228
iv. 12, . II. 175
iv. 12, 13, . II. 231
iv. 14, II. 183 f., 200, 220
iv. 15, . II. 192
iv. 16, . II. 217, 222
v. 1, 2, . II. 191
v. 3, . . II. 205
v. 4–6, 10, . II. 194
v. 5, . . II. 185 f.
v. 7, 8, . II. 193 f.
v. 8, . . II. 185
v. 9, II. 180, 193 f., 232
v. 11–14, . II. 222 f.
v. 13, . . II. 227
vi. 1, . II. 169, 220, 224
vi. 1, 2, . II. 222
vi. 2, . II. 219 f., 231, 233 f.
vi. 4, . . II. 220
vi. 4–8, . II. 228 f.

HEBREWS—*continued.*

CHAP. PAGE
vi. 5, . . II. 220, 222
vi. 9–12, . II. 230 f.
vi. 10, . II. 218
vi. 11, . II. 224
vi. 11, 12, . II. 228
vi. 12, 15, . II. 227
vi. 17, . II. 179
vi. 17, 20, . II. 223 f.
vi. 19, . II. 233
vi. 19, 20, . II. 197
vi. 20, . II. 216, 224
vii. 1, 2, . II. 200, 221
vii. 3, II. 186, 194 f.
vii. 4–10, 11–14, II. 194 f.
vii. 11, . II. 171
vii. 11, 12, . II. 170, 173
vii. 15, 16, . II. 194 f.
vii. 17–28, . II. 195 f.
vii. 18 (19), II. 171, 173
vii. 19, II. 174, 215, 224
vii. 23, 27 f., II. 171
vii. 25, . II. 215
vii. 26, . II. 192
vii. 28, II. 168 f., 185, 192 f.
viii. 2, 5, . II. 197
viii. 4, 5, . II. 198
viii. 6, . II. 170
viii. 6, 7, 8–12, II. 173 f.
viii. 9, . II. 169
viii. 10, II. 217, 220 f.
viii. 11, . II. 222
viii. 12, . II. 209
viii. 13, . II. 177
ix. 1, . . II. 171, 177
ix. (6) 7, . II. 196, 205
ix. 8, . . II. 177, 215
ix. 8, 9, . II. 171, 215
ix. 9, . . II. 181, 214
ix. 10, . II. 171, 173, 177, 181
ix. 11, . II. 197, 200
ix. 12, II. 197, 205 f., 209
ix. 13, . II. 171
ix. 13, 14, . II. 211 f.
ix. 14, II. 169, 202, 215
ix. 15, II. 167, 169, 178 f., 209, 219
ix. 15–18, . II. 207
ix. 19, . II. 212
ix. 19–25, . II. 205 f.
ix. 22, . II. 208
ix. 22, 23, . II. 207, 211
ix. 23, 24, . II. 197
ix. 24–26, . II. 205
ix. 25, . II. 205
ix. 26, . II. 181
ix. 26–28, . II. 203
ix. 27, . II. 210, 231
ix. 28, . II. 210, 224

HEBREWS—*continued.*

CHAP.	PAGE
x. 1,	II. 171 f., 214 f.
x. 2,	II. 212
x. 3,	II. 172
x. 4, 11,	II. 208
x. 5,	II. 190
x. 5–10,	II. 202 f.
x. 7–9,	II. 193
x. 10,	II. 213, 220
x. 12, 13,	II. 199
x. 12, 14,	II. 203
x. 14,	II. 213 f.
x. 16,	II. 220 f.
x. 17, 18,	II. 209
x. 18,	II. 177
x. 19–22,	II. 216, 226
x. 21,	II. 197, 200
x. 22,	II. 212, 215, 221
x. 22, 23,	II. 219 f.
x. 23,	II. 224 f.
x. 24, 25,	II. 222
x. 25,	II. 231 f.
x. 26,	II. 222
x. 26, 27,	II. 209
x. 26–28,	II. 228 f.
x. 28,	II. 168 f.
x. 29,	II. 206, 220, 229
x. 30, 31,	II. 231
x. 35, 36,	II. 227, 230
x. 37,	II. 232
x. 38, 39,	II. 227 f., 232
xi. 1–3,	II. 225
xi. 4–39,	II. 225–227
xi. 10, 13–16,	II. 167, 233
xi. 26,	II. 179
xi. 35,	II. 234
xi. 39, 40,	II. 167, 181, 214, 229 f.
xii. 1,	II. 222
xii. 2,	II. 193, 201, 225
xii. 5,	II. 175
xii. 6–8, 9,	II. 218
xii. 10, 11,	II. 221
xii. 10, 14,	II. 213, 221
xii. 12, 13, 15,	II. 222
xii. 15, 16,	II. 180, 228
xii. 16,	II. 219
xii. 17,	II. 229
xii. 18–21,	II. 168, 182
xii. 22,	II. 182, 233
xii. 22–24,	II. 198, 216
xii. 23,	II. 217, 219, 234
xii. 24,	II. 207, 212
xii. 24, 25,	II. 174 f.
xii. 25,	II. 226
xii. 25, 26,	II. 231
xii. 26–28,	II. 182, 233
xii. 28,	II. 215
xii. 28, 29,	II. 231
xiii. 7, 8,	II. 226
xiii. 9,	II. 177

HEBREWS—*continued.*

CHAP.	PAGE
xiii. 10,	II. 220
xiii. 10–13,	II. 180
xiii. 11, 12,	II. 205
xiii. 12,	II. 213
xiii. 13,	II. 177
xiii. 14,	II. 182, 233
xiii. 15, 16,	II. 196, 215
xiii. 16,	II. 218
xiii. 18,	II. 221
xiii. 20,	II. 197, 206, 217
xiii. 20, 21,	II. 200, 221
xiii. 25,	II. 221

JAMES.

CHAP.	PAGE
i. 2–12,	I. 266
i. 4,	I. 255, 260, 265
i. 4, 5,	I. 250
i. 5,	I. 262
i. 8,	I. 265 f.
i. 9,	I. 259, 262
i. 10, 11,	I. 265, 272
i. 12,	I. 257, 260
i. 13–15,	I. 267 f.
i. 17,	I. 261 f., 267
i. 17, 18,	I. 248
i. 18,	I. 249 f., 260
i. 19, 20,	I. 248
i. 21,	I. 248, 270
i. 21–25,	I. 250, 256 f.
i. 25,	I. 248–250
i. 26,	I. 249
i. 27,	I. 249, 261, 264
ii. 1,	I. 252
ii. 4,	I. 266
ii. 5,	I. 251, 259 f., 264
ii. 7,	I. 252
ii. 8–11,	I. 249
ii. 12,	I. 251, 271
ii. 13,	I. 272
ii. 14–16,	I. 255
ii. 14–26,	I. 251, 257
ii. 15, 16,	I. 255
ii. 17,	I. 254
ii. 18–22,	I. 255
ii. 19, 23,	I. 251
ii. 21–25,	I. 258 f.
ii. 26,	I. 254 f.
iii. 1–10,	I. 269 f.
iii. 6, 15,	I. 266
iii. 9,	I. 252, 261
iii. 13, 17,	I. 250, 270
iii. 14–16,	I. 268
iii. 17, 18,	I. 270
iv. 1, 2,	I. 268
iv. 2,	I. 249, 270
iv. 2, 3,	I. 267
iv. 4, 5,	I. 264
iv. 6–8,	I. 265
iv. 8–10,	I. 262
iv. 11,	I. 249, 262, 270

JAMES—*continued.*

CHAP.	PAGE
iv. 12,	I. 252, 272 f.
iv. 13–17,	I. 268
iv. 17,	I. 271
v. 1–9,	I. 272 f.
v. 4, 9,	I. 270
v. 7, 11,	I. 271
v. 10, 14, 15,	I. 252
v. 12,	I. 249
v. 13–16,	I. 262 f., 266 f.
v. 19, 20,	I. 248, 270
v. 20,	I. 262, 273

1 PETER.

CHAP.	PAGE
i. 1,	I. 243
i. 2,	I. 205 f., 234, 238
i. 3,	I. 216, 239, 246
i. 3–13,	I. 245
i. 4,	I. 240
i. 6–8,	I. 245
i. 7, 8,	I. 206
i. 8,	I. 219
i. 10–12,	I. 216
i. 10–13,	I. 212
i. 11,	I. 227, 239
i. 12,	I. 164, 238
i. 13,	I. 246
i. 14,	I. 208, 215, 217
i. 14–17,	I. 214 f., 235, 246
i. 18,	I. 208, 217, 235
i. 19–21,	I. 227
i. 19,	I. 231
i. 20,	I. 217, 240, 244
i. 21,	I. 206, 239 f.
i. 22,	I. 221
i. 22–25,	I. 216 f.
ii. 2–4,	I. 218 f.
ii. 5,	I. 210, 213 f., 219
ii. 5–9,	I. 207 f.
ii. 6, 7,	I. 237, 247
ii. 7,	I. 382
ii. 7, 8,	I. 205 f.
ii. 9,	I. 213, 241
ii. 9, 10,	I. 211
ii. 11,	I. 217 f., 243, 246
ii. 11, 12,	I. 224 f.
ii. 13–17,	I. 223
ii. 16,	I. 212 f.
ii. 18–20,	I. 223
ii. 19, 20,	I. 212
ii. 19–23,	I. 220, 231
ii. 24,	I. 212, 232, 236
ii. 25,	I. 208, 211, 217
iii. 1–7,	I. 223 f.
iii. 6,	I. 215
iii. 7, 9,	I. 240
iii. 10–14,	I. 212 f., 247
iii. 15–18,	I. 225
iii. 16,	I. 218 f., 224
iii. 18,	I. 213, 228 f., 231

1 PETER—*continued.*

CHAP.	PAGE
iii. 19,	I. 229, 241
iii. 20, 21,	I. 207 f., 241
iii. 21, 22,	I. 242
iii. 22,	I. 237 f.
iv. 1,	I. 237
iv. 1, 2,	I. 220 f.
iv. 3,	I. 217
iv. 4,	I. 224
iv. 5, 6,	I. 241 f.
iv. 8, 9, 10,	I. 221 f.
iv. 11,	I. 219, 238
iv. 12, 13,	I. 219 f.
iv. 13,	I. 246 f.
iv. 14,	I. 206, 219, 245
iv. 15,	I. 223, 225
iv. 15, 16,	I. 225
iv. 17,	I. 210, 216, 241
iv. 17, 18,	I. 208, 242, 244 f.
v. 1-3, 5,	I. 222
v. 2-4,	I. 211
v. 6, 8, 9,	I. 219 f.
v. 10,	I. 211 f., 239 f., 247
v. 12,	I. 212, 214, 221
v. 14,	I. 222

2 PETER.

i. 1,	II. 238
i. 2-4,	II. 235 f.
i. 3-5,	II. 239, 240 f.
i. 5-7,	II. 242
i. 5, 11,	II. 240, 247
i. 8, 9,	II. 239 f.
i. 9,	II. 238
i. 10,	II. 241 f.
i. 12,	II. 240
i. 13, 14,	II. 248
i. 16-21,	II. 236 f.
ii. 1,	II. 237 f., 240
ii. 1-3,	II. 243
ii. 3-6, 9,	II. 244 f.
ii. 7, 10, 11,	II. 242 f.
ii. 13, 15,	II. 247 f.
ii. 17-19,	II. 243
ii. 20, 21,	II. 240 f., 248
iii. 2,	II. 241
iii. 3, 4,	II. 246 f.
iii. 5-7,	II. 245 f.
iii. 8,	II. 247
iii. 9,	II. 247
iii. 10-12,	II. 246 f.
iii. 11, 14,	II. 241
iii. 13,	II. 248
iii. 14-16,	II. 241
iii. 15,	II. 247
iii. 16,	II. 243
iii. 18,	II. 235

1 JOHN.

CHAP.	PAGE
i. 1,	II. 344, 350
i. 1, 2,	II. 341 f., 349
i. 3,	II. 372, 411
i. 5,	II. 377
i. 5, 7,	II. 353 f., 372
i. 6,	II. 355
i. 7,	II. 375, 411 f.
i. 7-9,	II. 359 f., 381
i. 8-10,	II. 359, 375
i. 9,	II. 355
ii. 1, 2,	II. 359 f.
ii. 3-6,	II. 371
ii. 3, 4,	II. 351
ii. 4,	II. 370
ii. 5,	II. 377, 379
ii. 5, 6,	II. 378 f.
ii. 7,	II. 377, 389
ii. 8,	II. 353
ii. 9-11,	II. 354, 381, 413
ii. 12,	II. 360
ii. 14,	II. 374
ii. 15, 16,	II. 357, 414
ii. 15-17,	II. 393
ii. 16,	II. 345
ii. 17,	II. 358, 377, 419 f.
ii. 18,	II. 417 f.
ii. 19,	II. 382, 399, 414
ii. 20,	II. 355, 407
ii. 20, 21,	II. 408
ii. 21,	II. 354 f.
ii. 21, 22,	II. 374
ii. 22,	II. 417
ii. 23,	II. 351
ii. 24,	II. 369, 371
ii. 25,	II. 348, 371
ii. 27,	II. 370, 373, 407 f., 412
ii. 27, 28,	II. 371
ii. 28,	II. 383 f., 416
ii. 28, 29,	II. 373
ii. 29,	II. 355, 373, 376 f.
iii. 1,	II. 376, 415
iii. 2, 3,	II. 384, 420
iii. 3,	II. 381
iii. 4,	II. 377
iii. 5,	II. 359 f.
iii. 5, 6,	II. 356, 370
iii. 5, 8,	II. 344, 375
iii. 6,	II. 351, 381
iii. 8,	II. 375, 394, 397
iii. 9,	II. 374
iii. 9, 10,	II. 375
iii. 10, 11,	II. 377 f.
iii. 14,	II. 348, 351, 358, 419
iii. 15,	II. 382, 413
iii. 16,	II. 357, 362
iii. 19,	II. 355, 374
iii. 19, 20,	II. 381 f.
iii. 21, 22,	II. 403 f.

1 JOHN—*continued.*

CHAP.	PAGE
iii. 23,	II. 378
iii. 24,	II. 372 f., 379
iv. 1-3,	II. 373, 407
iv. 1-17,	II. 379 f.
iv. 2,	II. 344, 409 f.
iv. 3,	II. 417
iv. 4,	II. 372 ff., 398
iv. 5,	II. 414
iv. 6,	II. 373, 375, 407
iv. 7,	II. 373 ff.
iv. 8,	II. 351, 356
iv. 9,	II. 350
iv. 9, 10, 14,	II. 339, 356
iv. 10,	II. 359
iv. 11 (19),	II. 356
iv. 12, 13,	II. 372
iv. 12 (20),	II. 344
iv. 13,	II. 372, 407, 409
iv. 14,	II. 344
iv. 15,	II. 372 f., 410
iv. 16,	II. 356, 364 f.
iv. 16, 19,	II. 413
iv. 17,	II. 413, 419
iv. 17, 18,	II. 383
iv. 19,	II. 380
iv. 20, 21,	II. 413
v. 1-4,	II. 374
v. 1,	II. 374, 376
v. 1, 2,	II. 380, 413
v. 2, 3,	II. 378
v. 4,	II. 374, 378
v. 4, 5,	II. 374, 376
v. 6,	II. 344, 408, 412
v. 6, 7,	II. 407, 410
v. 7-9,	II. 366
v. 7, 8,	II. 410
v. 10, 11,	II. 366
v. 11,	II. 350
v. 14, 15,	II. 404
v. 16,	II. 358, 361, 404, 419
v. 16, 17,	II. 381 f.
v. 17,	II. 377
v. 18,	II. 381, 398
v. 19,	II. 398
v. 19, 20,	II. 373
v. 20,	II. 341, 350, 354, 368
v. 21,	II. 414

2 JOHN.

Ver. 1,	II. 411 f.
Ver. 2,	II. 375
Ver. 5,	II. 389
Ver. 7,	II. 344, 417
Ver. 8,	II. 384
Ver. 9,	II. 338, 351, 356
Vv. 10, 11,	II. 414
Ver. 13,	II. 411

3 JOHN.

CHAP.	PAGE
Ver. 1,	II. 412
Ver. 4,	II. 355
Ver. 8,	II. 410
Vv. 9, 10,	II. 411 f.
Ver. 11,	II. 351, 373 ff., 381

JUDE.

Vv. 1, 4,	II. 236
Vv. 3, 4,	II. 238
Vv. 3, 5,	II. 246
Ver. 4,	II. 243 f.
Ver. 5,	II. 235, 244
Vv. 6, 7, 11,	II. 244 f.
Vv. 8–10,	II. 243
Ver. 9,	II. 236
Ver. 10,	II. 245
Ver. 12,	II. 239 f., 243
Vv. 14, 15,	II. 236, 244 f.
Vv. 17, 18,	II. 246
Ver. 19,	II. 243
Vv. 20, 21,	II. 242
Ver. 21,	II. 247 f.
Vv. 23, 25,	II. 246
Ver. 24,	II. 241, 245

REVELATION.

i. 1, 2,	II. 282
i. 5,	II. 274 f., 282
i. 6,	II. 251
i. 10, 18,	II. 274
i. 13,	II. 273
i. 14, 16, 17,	II. 275 f.
i. 20,	II. 270
ii. 7,	II. 266
ii. 8,	II. 276
ii. 9,	II. 251 f.
ii. 11,	II. 264
ii. 14, 20,	II. 279
ii. 17,	II. 266
ii. 24,	II. 257, 272
ii. 28,	II. 266
iii. 4, 5,	II. 266, 278
iii. 5,	II. 281

REVELATION—*continued.*

CHAP.	PAGE
iii. 7,	II. 274 f.
iii. 9,	II. 251
iii. 10,	II. 264
iii. 12,	II. 265 f.
iii. 14,	II. 276, 282
iii. 18,	II. 278
iii. 18–20,	II. 281
iv. 4,	II. 268 f.
iv. 5,	II. 283 f.
iv. 6–9,	II. 268
iv. 10, 11,	II. 269
v. 5, 6,	II. 273 f.
v. 6,	II. 283
v. 9,	II. 282
vi. 1–17,	II. 250
vi. 11,	II. 253, 266
vii. 1–3,	II. 269
vii. 2–8,	II. 252
vii. 9–17,	II. 253
vii. 9,	II. 266
vii. 14,	II. 254, 273
vii. 15, 17,	II. 265 f.
viii. 2–5,	II. 270
viii. 6–13,	II. 250 f.
ix. 1–21,	II. 250
ix. 1, 2, 11, 14, 20,	II. 271
ix. 4,	II. 252
x. 7–11,	II. 282
xi. 1–13,	II. 253 f.
xi. 7,	II. 255, 258, 260
xi. 8,	II. 252, 284
xi. 13–15,	II. 254, 262
xii. 1, 2, 6, 13, 17,	II. 251
xii. 3–5, 7–9, 12–16,	II. 270 ff.
xii. 5,	II. 273, 277
xii. 6, 13–16,	II. 253
xii. 9–11,	II. 274
xii. 10, 17,	II. 280 f.
xiii. 1–8,	II. 255 f., 257 f.
xiii. 11–17,	II. 256 f.
xiii. 12, 14,	II. 255
xiii. 18,	II. 257, 284
xiv. 1–3,	II. 252

REVELATION—*continued.*

CHAP.	PAGE
xiv. 3, 4,	II. 274
xiv. 4, 5,	II. 279
xiv. 6,	II. 282
xiv. 8,	II. 260
xiv. 8–11,	II. 251
xiv. 10, 11, 13,	II. 264
xiv. 12, 13,	II. 280
xiv. 14–20,	II. 261
xiv. 18,	II. 267
xiv. 20,	II. 252
xv. 3,	II. 265
xv. 8,	II. 267
xvi. 1–11,	II. 250 f.
xvi. 12–16,	II. 252, 260
xvi. 13, 14,	II. 272
xvi. 15,	II. 278
xvi. 17–21,	II. 251
xvi. 18, 19,	II. 254
xvi. 20, 21,	II. 260
xvii. 1–6,	II. 259 f.
xvii. 3–11, 16,	II. 258 f.
xvii. 9,	II. 284
xvii. 11–14,	II. 256 f.
xvii. 12–17,	II. 260
xvii. 14,	II. 281
xviii. 2,	II. 272
xviii. 4,	II. 260
xviii. 6, 7,	II. 264
xviii. 21–24,	II. 260
xix. 1,	II. 281
xix. 7–9,	II. 265
xix. 8,	II. 266, 278
xix. 10,	II. 280, 282
xix. 11–21,	II. 260 f.
xix. 13,	II. 276
xx. 1–3,	II. 262, 271 f.
xx. 4–10,	II. 262 f., 272
xx. 11–15,	II. 263 f.
xxi. 1–xxii. 5,	II. 264–6
xxi. 24, 26,	II. 265
xxii. 6,	II. 283
xxii. 13,	II. 276
xxii. 14,	II. 273
xxii. 16,	II. 275

MORRISON AND GIBB, EDINBURGH,
PRINTERS TO HER MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICE.

00111699

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 05 October, 2018